


The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 20, Number 5/6

www.ihr.org

September/December 2001



Anti-Defamation League Machinations

Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.

Höttl and the Elusive 'Six Million'

Mark Weber

Zyklon 'Holes' in Birkenau

Brian Renk

Holocausts: Imaginary and Real

Robert Faurisson

Irving's 'Real History' Meeting

— Reviews —

Two New Views of Pearl Harbor

Theodore J. O'Keefe

Four Books on Hitler-Stalin Clash

Daniel Michaels

— And More —

60th anniversary of "Operation Barbarossa"

Joachim Hoffmann *Stalin's War of Extermination* 1941-1945

Planning, Realization and Documentation


416 pp. (6¹/₈"x9¹/₄"), documents, bibliography, index, hard cover, cloth bound, ribbon marker, color dust jacket, shrink wrapped, \$39.95 plus shipping & handling (\$5.05 for a single copy.)

"Joachim Hoffmann explores Stalin's conduct of the 'war of annihilation' against the Germans and powerfully records its propaganda."


Prof. Richard C. Raack,
Calif. State University

"Hoffmann's postulate should be decisive that the extent of Stalin's war of conquest and extermination as well as of the strategic justification of the German preventive war ought to be finally taken notice of."

Öster. Militärische Zeitschrift



The outbreak of war in 1939 gave Soviet dictator Stalin a long-awaited opportunity to begin putting into effect his plan for a war of conquest against Europe. This did not escape Hitler's notice, who responded by planning a preventive strike against the Soviet colossus. In this thoroughly documented study, Dr. Hoffmann proves Stalin's aggressive intentions, shows how Soviet propagandists incited Red Army troops to ferocious hatred against everything German, details the Red Army's horrific treatment of German prisoners of war, and shows how the Soviets used unimaginable violence to force their unwilling troops into battle. Finally, this book documents the Red Army's orgy of mass murder, looting, arson, rape and torture across central Europe, and especially in eastern Germany. As Hoffmann shows, Stalin's war was, in truth, a war of extermination both against Germans and the peoples of the Soviet Union. It was not before 1948 that the US government realized that it fought against the wrong enemy in Europe during WWII. The author, for years a historian with a leading German government history institute, is one of the world's foremost experts on the titanic German-Soviet conflict. This critically acclaimed book has been a big success in Germany, in spite of efforts by leftists to ban it and punish its author.



"A significant monograph from the indefatigable Jürgen Graf—and yet another contribution to the body of work at the center of holocaust revisionism. That he writes charmingly, too, is an additional dividend."

Andrew Gray, Copy
Editor, *The Barnes
Review*

"[A] perhaps shocking revelation of the shoddy evidence that the [Holocaust] legend is based on and [...] a specific important application of a good part of the revisionist scholarship of the past quarter century."

Prof. Dr. Arthur R. Butz, Northwestern University

Jürgen Graf

The Giant With Feet of Clay

Raul Hilberg and his Standard Work on the Holocaust

128 pp. (6¹/₈"x9¹/₄"), bibliography, index, paper back, \$9.95 plus shipping & handling (\$4.05 for a single copy.)

Let's assume you have no thorough knowledge about the Holocaust or Holocaust Revisionism, and would prefer a small booklet over large volumes to learn more about it. Or let's assume you wanted to get a friend or relative to rethink his preconceptions on the Holocaust without much reading. If this applies to you, this book is perfect.

Graf analyzes the standard work on the Holocaust, Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*, using his sharp mind, a critical attitude and all the cutting edge knowledge of the most recent research. Hilberg himself admitted once: "*Superficiality is the major disease in the field of Holocaust studies*," and Graf proves that this applies to Hilberg himself. This book gives an overview of the orthodox Holocaust story, explains all major revisionist arguments, and refutes many central claims of the most prominent Holocaust scholar. There is no better book to convince the layman!

YOUR PURCHASE HELPS SUPPORT A WORTHY CAUSE
Thirty percent of the income from sales of T&DP books is set aside
for the legal defense of persecuted dissident historians.



Theses & Dissertations Press

Send mail orders to: T&DP, PO Box 64, Capshaw, AL 35742, USA, or call us toll free at 1-877-789-0229
Order online with Master or Visa Card at www.tadp.org. Send fax orders to: 1-413-778-5749

Ask for discounts on bulk purchases!

Director: Mark Weber
Editor: Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokesmen of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District (ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Electrical
and Computer Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Santa Fe Springs, California

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
Professor of French Literature (ret.)
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Beverly Hills, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

GERMAR RUDOLF, Dipl.-Chem.
Hastings, England

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

C. ZAVERDINOS, Ph.D.
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 20, Number 5/6

September / December 2001

— I N T H I S I S S U E —

From the Editor	2
Review and Revision	3
'Real History' in Cincinnati	6
Trieste Meeting: 'Revisionism and Dignity'	8
In Other Journals	9
Was Holocaust Survivor Viktor Frankl Gassed at Auschwitz?	10
Machinations of the Anti-Defamation League <i>Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.</i>	13
Wilhelm Höttl and the Elusive 'Six Million' <i>Mark Weber</i>	25
Convergence or Divergence?: Recent Evidence for Zyklon Induction Holes at Birkenau Crematory II <i>Brian Renk</i>	33
An Imaginary Holocaust May Lead to a Real Holocaust <i>Robert Faurisson</i>	52
Four Books on the 1941-1945 German-Soviet War <i>A review article by Daniel Michaels</i>	59
Pearl Harbor: Case Closed?: Books by Stinnett and Gannon <i>A review by Theodore O'Keefe</i>	70
Typhus and Cholera, Nazis and Jews <i>A review by Samuel Crowell</i>	75
<i>Destruction Destroyed: Graf's Dissection of Hilberg</i> <i>A review by Theodore O'Keefe</i>	77
Letters	80

On the cover: American battleships at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, following the Japanese attack on the morning of December 7, 1941.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the revisionist tradition of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A. J. P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier, and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: \$40 per year, \$65 for two years, and \$90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add \$20 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add \$40 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in U.S. dollars drawable on a U.S. bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

Single copies of most *Journal* issues published since spring 1986 (volume 7) are available for \$7.50 each, plus \$2.00 shipping. Ask about the availability of specific issues. Hardbound annual volumes of the *Journal* for the years 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 are also available for \$40.00 each, plus \$3.50 shipping. Write for our booklist and prices.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on diskette. Send all correspondence to P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. E-mail to: ihr@ihr.org. Web site: <http://www.ihr.org>.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: \$40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the editor.

THIS EXPANDED ISSUE of the *Journal* coincides with the sixtieth anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack. As it goes to press, the same questions about Pearl Harbor -- to what extent did U.S. policies invite the attack? how much did our government know in advance? -- still swirl around the ruins of the World Trade Center and the badly damaged Pentagon. Skepticism of the official version is hardly limited to these two "surprise attacks," however, for in Russia, in Germany, and even in America a growing number of historians is challenging the standard story that Hitler's June 1941 invasion of the USSR was unprovoked aggression. Each of these issues is dealt with incisively and informatively in this double issue of the JHR.

In the following pages Robert Faurisson argues that we Americans, after decades of support for Israeli oppression of the Palestinians and years of waging of push-button wars against Muslim countries, should certainly have been forewarned. He argues that the cult of the "Holocaust," with its message that the Jews are only victims and always victims, and thus all is allowed them, may propel the world into a real holocaust, where all will be victims. An expanded Revisionist News & Comment section looks with a jaundiced eye at the latest on 9/11, including the explosive, and scandalously underreported, news that scores of Israeli agents may have been spying on the alleged perpetrators of the World Trade and Pentagon massacres -- and that those Israelis who weren't spying on the terrorists were probably spying on us.

Russian specialist Dan Michaels, whose work has appeared frequently in these pages, assays the latest literature from Russia and Germany on the growing historical debate over Operation Barbarossa. Michaels examines the increasing evidence that Josef Stalin was aware of the German build-up, and was planning to strike first, and considers, if so, why the cunning Red despot was beaten to the punch. Then an editorial review looks at two recent books on Pearl Harbor, each of them claiming to solve the mystery of how much FDR and his government knew.

We are honored to publish the text of former Congressman Paul McCloskey's lecture to IHR's last conference. This highly decorated combat Marine and eminent American patriot placed defending his country's real interests, upholding its laws, and supporting justice at home and abroad ahead of his own political career. While McCloskey has made it clear that he is not a revisionist

on the essentials of the Holocaust, his lecture shows that revisionism has a wide spectrum, and a growing potential to engage men and women of outstanding character and achievement.

IHR director Mark Weber takes aim at the sacrosanct Six Million number, by way of an examination of the career of one of its chief authorities, ex-SS officer (and ex-CIA agent) Wilhelm Höttl. The result is a fine essay that reevaluates Höttl's credibility in light of new documents, and shows that the "Six Million" is not merely a sacred cow, but one that is industriously milked by the Holocaust industry.

Perhaps the most important article in this big issue focuses on the seemingly insignificant. Yet in his brilliant survey of the evidence for (and against) needed to have introduced the killing agent into the most notorious "gas chamber" of Auschwitz, Brian Renk, a long-time revisionist researcher with a professional knowledge of construction techniques, establishes that there are no holes, and there were no holes, in the "gas chamber" roof. His deconstruction of the evidence offered by the other side's leading experts, in last year's riveting Irving trial and elsewhere, aims a mortal blow at an Achilles heel of the Auschwitz myth.

That's far from all, of course. Our double year-end number features a review of Jürgen Graf's valuable take-down of Raul Hilberg's hypertrophied Holocaust history. Samuel Crowell surveys Paul Weindling's double-edged book on epidemics and genocide in eastern Europe between 1890 and 1945. There is much news, and more comment, with detailed reports on revisionist conferences here and abroad, an update from Robert Faurisson on persecution and France and Switzerland, notice of items of interest in the professional journals, and more.

As long-suffering subscribers will recognize, this double issue is meant to help us to catch up as well as to catch you up. You have our promise that we'll make up the "missing" pages, and be back on schedule at last, as quickly as possible during the next year.

— Theodore J. O'Keefe

Review and Revision

AFGHANISTAN: “To robbery, slaughter, plunder, they give the lying name of empire; they make a desert, and call it peace,” wrote the Roman historian Tacitus, in a free version of a British terrorist’s anti-Roman rant nearly two millennia ago. Afghanistan seems to have been mostly desert even before the past twenty years of war and anarchy, but whatever hadn’t been desert is today, after official America morphed the angry zeal of the populace against the suspected masterminds of the 9/11 attacks into a general war to overthrow the Afghan government. President Bush and his advisors evidently believed that, like the unfortunate hamlet in Vietnam, Afghanistan had to be destroyed to save it. As ordnance rained down in unprecedented quantity and quality, considering the size of the targets, we Americans were able to chortle over colorful but sanitized graphics demonstrating the efficacy of this or that bomb or missile, in the warm comfort of their own living rooms, as the Afghans died in their thousands and fled in their millions. There were even instances of civilians being brained by cases of the dehydrated junk food that Uncle Sam is dropping as a salve to the consciences of our softer-hearted citizens (while the threat of mass starvation rises unabated). It is well that our leaders refer to this as a war, and not a “police action”: as of this writing a tape of the elusive Osama bin Laden has been found, but not the world’s most wanted criminal.

KUNDUZ: One didn’t have to be a revisionist to wonder about the official story of a prison uprising by non-Afghan volunteers who had fought for the Taliban. Supposedly these foreign prisoners of war, evidently particularly hated by their Northern Alliance captors, had somehow secreted weapons on their persons, and then managed to smuggle them, while captive, into the fortress prison at Kunduz (one hopes that those of their warders who receive the bonus of immigration papers to America will find employment elsewhere than in airport security). Evidently the U.S. special forces and the civilian commissars from the Defense Department and the CIA who were supervising the NA on the spot had somehow been distracted. What happened next certainly had many of the earmarks of a massacre (as British foreign minister Jack Straw called it), with hundreds of the POWs slaughtered by machine gun fire and by air

strikes called in by a “hero” Green Beret (as if he and a handful of Montagnards had been beset by a Viet Cong battalion). We can’t help wondering what the “international community” would have made of such a slaughter if it had happened at the hands of the Serbs in Kosovo, or been perpetrated by other certified bad guys. Meanwhile, the United States continues to pursue, try, and depart 80- and 90-year-old men whose only crime was to stand guard outside a forced labor camp in central Europe sixty years ago.

WASHINGTON: The debate in the councils of the U.S. government over the aims of the global war against terrorism seems to have taken shape as a contest between two wings of the Bush administration. Team America, headed by Secretary of State Colin Powell, is doing battle with Team Israel, led by an undersecretary (!) from the Defense Department, Paul Wolfowitz, for the heart and mind of President George W. Bush. Team Israel, needless to say, desires that America’s armed forces begin doing Israel’s immediate bidding against Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and whatever other targets the government in Jerusalem may designate. The opportunists who abound in any Washington administration, such as Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who’s added a steel edge to his tinhorn core in his manic impersonation of Robert McNamara, are poised to jump whichever way will advance their personal fortunes. While many say that after 9/11, everything has changed, it’s good to see that some things haven’t, such as the presence of Richard Perle as a top advisor in the unabashedly Zionist Wolfowitz camp. In the 1970s, Perle was investigated for passing intelligence to Israel while a congressional staffer with access to America defense secrets, dealing with defense matters in the 1970s. (Surprise! The case unaccountably petered out.). We hesitate to use the term “dual loyalist” for the Wolfowitzes and Perles ... at least until we discover which is the *second* country that they’re loyal to.

CAPITOL HILL: Twenty-six years ago, three quarters of the U.S. Senate in effect pledged allegiance to Israel by publicly demanding that President Ford continue providing Israel with a free lunch (courtesy of American taxpayers) and a free hand in the Middle East, U.S. laws and American interests be damned. Recently eighty-nine spineless U.S. senators provided a new profile in cowardice. Apparently stung by lip service the Bush



Irv Rubin, leader of the Jewish Defense League, harangues a crowd. On December 11, 2001, Rubin was arrested along with JDL member Earl Krugel, and charged with plotting to blow up a Los Angeles mosque and the office of a US congressman. The JDL is a militant Zionist group with a long record of terrorist activities. In 1985 the FBI identified it as "the second most active terrorist group in the United States," linking it to 37 terrorist attacks carried out from 1977 to 1984. In 1987 the FBI announced that Jewish extremist groups had carried out 24 terrorist acts from 1981 through 1986, 17 of which were the work of the JDL.

The Institute for Historical Review was a target of systematic JDL violence and harassment during the 1980s. The attacks included a drive-by shooting, three firebombings, vandalism of IHR employee-owned vehicles, 22 slashings of tires of employee automobiles, demonstrations outside the IHR office, and numerous telephone threats. This campaign culminated in a devastating arson attack on the Institute's offices and warehouse in the early morning hours of July 4, 1984. Damage was estimated at \$400,000. No one was ever arrested in connection with this crime. In February 1989 JDL intimidation forced the cancellation at two hotel sites in southern California of a three-day IHR conference. The meeting was successfully held at a makeshift alternate site, in spite of further harassment by a handful of JDL thugs led by Rubin.

An IHR news release on the arrest of Rubin and Krugel is posted on the "News & Views" section of the IHR web site. "The Zionist Terror Network," an IHR report with detailed information about Rubin and the JDL, is posted on the site's "Books on-line" section.

administration had given to the proposition that the Palestinians deserve something like their own country, infested by Israeli colonies, police, and soldiers though it might be, on the 22 percent of pre-1948 Palestine that remains to them, the legislators, with the dog-like fidelity of a mutt bringing its master his slipper, reprimanded the president for being insufficiently attentive to Israel's interests. Soon enough, President Bush was cozying up to Prime Minister Sharon, posturing in front of the Mogen David, and insuring that our ambassador to the UN veto any resolution critical of Israel's racist, murderous policies against the Palestinians. Two images from this past autumn stick in our mind: the New York city firefighters, many of them heavily laden with equipment, toiling up the stairs of the burning World Trade Center towers, and the entire U.S. Senate, its vast entourage of staffers and camp followers hot on its heels, swarming pell-mell out of the Capitol at the first word that a letter containing anthrax had made its way to their post office.

JUSTICE: Against the ominous backdrop of the new P.A.T.R.I.O.T. law (with its disarmingly corny acronym and its threatening implications for our constitutional liberties), Jewish groups that have long enjoyed an entree with law enforcement groups were spreading fabrications aimed at revisionists and revisionist groups. Thus in October Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center told the world press that unnamed revisionists who had attended a conference in Beirut together with "Islamic militants" earlier in the year might well be behind the anthrax attacks. The rabbi's fib that the conference had taken place (it was banned under U.S. pressure), and his strong implication that IHR staffers and associates involved in conference preparations had been busily dispatching anthrax spores, wound up in prominent outlets such as the *Washington Post* (October 27) and the (London) *Observer* (October 28), sandwiched among less explicit accusations against the American "right wing" from U.S. government sources. Despite a Halloween flurry of similar reports featuring denunciations from Cooper, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and other professional anti-anti-Semites, the FBI recently announced that all such "leads" have proved worthless.

TREACHERY: News that at least sixty Israelis have been detained and investigated for espionage by the U.S. government since September 11 may account for the squid-like efforts of Cooper and other cuttlefish to jet

obfuscatory ink, while Israel-firsters inside and outside the American government work feverishly to control the damage. The story, broken by Fox News on December 12, reveals that as many as two hundred likely Israeli agents are strongly suspected of having spied on the terrorists who carried out the September 11 attacks, as well as on American military bases, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Agent, and American officials throughout law enforcement and intelligence. The Fox report also revealed that American officials believe that the Israelis may have known of the attacks in advance, but failed to inform the U.S. In another choice revelation, Fox reported that six of the suspects worked for an Israeli-based company, Amdocs, which has had access to virtually any private telephone call made in the United States through its telephone “security” contracts with America’s twenty-five biggest phone companies. (Is that why Bill Clinton tried to warn Monica a few years back — or had she already been “warned”?). This story was still unfolding as this issue went to press, but only on Fox News: five days after its first part was released, America’s thousands of other news hounds, normally straining at the leash for any plausible scuttlebutt or scandal, were acting like the timid lapdogs they are when faced with *real* news.

TERROR: The arrest of Zionist goon Irv Rubin and his thuggish aide-de-camp, Earl Krugel, for allegedly plotting to assassinate U.S. congressman Darrell Issa and to blow up a mosque in Los Angeles, comes better late than never, or so we may hope. Rubin is reportedly still considered a suspect in the 1985 bombing murder of Palestinian poet Alex Odeh, just a few miles up the road from the IHR’s offices. There was no mention in the news reports of the July 4, 1984, destruction of the Institute’s offices and stocks, although Rubin visited the wreckage of the building and the heaps of ruined revisionist books to gloat publicly over the attack, as he later gloated over Odeh’s death. Convicted for that murder, after years of delay (as the suspects lurked in Israel’s occupied territories on the Jordan’s West Bank, allegedly beyond Israeli reach): several former members of Rubin’s Jewish Defense League who were probably trained, and certainly protected, by the State of Israel. Did someone say “terrorism”? Be sure it wasn’t the Bush administration.

NEW YORK/JERUSALEM: Did six thousand really die? As inflated figures for WTC deaths were being revised, to coin a word, downward, New York’s Mayor Rudy

Giuliani renewed a long mayoral tradition of snubbing Arabs (Robert Wagner refusing to meet with Saudi Arabian King Ibn Saud; Ed Koch snubbing Yasser Arafat; Giuliani snubbing Arafat) and snuggling with Israelis. Soon after the attacks, Giuliani turned down a ten million dollar contribution to the survivors and victims’ families from a wealthy Saudi who had dared to name Israeli oppression of the Palestinians as a factor in the attacks. Then, not too long after having participated by telephone in a Jerusalem conference organized to expel the Palestinians from the West Bank and their refugee camps on the Gaza strip, the mayor doffed his Yankee cap for a yarmulke, to mourn the only Mideast victims who really count, together with war/peace criminal Sharon and various of his accomplices in Jerusalem. The Butcher of Beirut, now wanted by Belgium for his role in the Sabra and Shatila massacre (a recent BBC program reported that dozens of the massacre victims had been led off to be dealt with by the Israelis) and lately reprimanded by Amnesty International for his current policy of torturing prisoners, had earlier promised Giuliani that Israel would be planting five thousand scrawny trees in Jerusalem in memory of the dead. Sounds to us like a poor trade for ten million dollars of relief for those in need — and don’t think the Israelis aren’t waiting for the casualty figures to drop some more before they start planting.

THE HOLOCAUST: Rumors of the demise of the big H on September 11 turn out to have been greatly exaggerated. After all, James D. Bindenagel, America’s official ambassador to the Holocaust (or was it from the Holocaust?) continues his work of arm-twisting and indoctrination in support of still more “reparations” and ever more Holocaust “education.” If some readers imagine that the designation “Holocaust ambassador” is a tad overdrawn, the unembroidered truth is that Bindenagel, a career diplomat, was raised to ambassadorial status and designated “Special Envoy on Holocaust Issues” by President Clinton in 1999 (reportedly as a reward for his service in helping Stuart Eizenstat gouge Germany for \$5.2 more billion, this time in “reparations” to “slave laborers”). Bindenagel, reported a little-noticed story issued by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency back on July 10, “is proud to be the full-time point person,” and hails “the emphasis the Bush administration has placed on Holocaust issues, as evidenced by his ‘open-ended’ mandate.” He’s still at it, of course, devoting what was once Americans’ hard-won money to “promoting

national memorial days and programming in schools and helping develop teacher training programs” in ten different foreign countries, probably even as you’re reading this ... The Holocaust is alive and well, too, in the universities. In a recent and typical incident, a flyer announcing a lecture on the “Search for Survivors: The Fate of the *Saint Louis*” was circulated in the mathematics department of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Given on October 1, it didn’t coincide with any of known Holocaust holidays and didn’t seem to speak to any particular concerns of mathematicians. If anything, the Holocausters would seem to need schooling in math (arithmetic might suffice) more than mathematicians need Holocaust “education.” ... Like the *Flying Dutchman*, the *St. Louis*, the Hapag liner that carried Jews from Europe to Cuba — and back again — in 1939 seems to be popping up everywhere these days. The latest sighting was in a big-think essay by Stephen Steinlight, a Senior Fellow of the American Jewish Congress, that counsels American Jews to rethink their traditional support for unlimited immigration (except for revisionists and Nazi “war criminals”). It’s rather evident that, its orotund arguments aside, the Steinlight article (titled “The Jewish Stake in America’s Changing Demography,” accessible at <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.html>, the website of the Center for Immigration Studies) means to say that too many Muslims are coming to America now for Jewish comfort. The *St. Louis* makes its appearance in an elaborate bit of shtick (subtitled “Leaving Inviolable the Holy of Holies”) wherein the writer takes pains not to seem to give comfort to the American immigration policy that prevailed from the 1920s to the 1960s. Here Steinlight decries America’s “evil, xenophobic, anti-Semitic, and Red Menace-based Great Pause” — and he’s only talking about the 1920s! As for American policy in the 1930s and 1940s (when in fact hundreds of thousands of Jews were admitted to the U.S.), Steinlight informs us with poker face that “... only handful were grudgingly granted safety here”; decries the nation’s “vast moral failure”; bewails “appalling tales of grotesque treatment” (of prospective Jewish immigrants); and invokes the odyssey of the *St. Louis* (which, contrary to Steinlight’s imaginings, never even attempted to land in the U.S.) as “perhaps the most poignant and most widely known instance of this monstrous policy.” Aside from what Steinlight’s article reveals about Jews’ perceptions of Jewish influence over U.S. immigration policy, for all its nods to “civic virtue” it reveals an appalling self-cen-

teredness: as when Steinlight hazards that America’s restrictive immigration laws were “arguably the greatest moral failure in its history,” nosing out, one supposes, the execution of the Rosenbergs, the Pollard sentence, slavery, and the dispossession of the Indians (probably in that order).

‘Real History’ in Cincinnati

With a robust attendance and informative, stimulating addresses, David Irving’s third annual “Real History” conference was a roaring success. About 150 persons, most of them from the eastern and central United States, and a few from as far away as Australia, met over Labor Day weekend — Friday, August 31, through Monday, September 3 — at a large, first-class hotel in a suburb of Cincinnati.

Irving, the conference organizer and host, was the central figure of the four-day event. The well-known British historian also delivered several talks himself and introduced and commented on the presentations of the other speakers.

In his opening night talk, “The Modern Plague: Historical Conformism,” Irving expressed the hope that in coming years the term “conformist historian” will become a widely used epithet. On Sunday Irving spoke about Winston Churchill’s secret wartime communications with President Roosevelt, exchanges that are dealt with in some detail in his *Churchill’s War* trilogy.

In a Saturday lecture, “Hitler and the Final Solution: Are We Any Nearer to the Truth?,” Irving cited copies of little known World War II documents that were also distributed to the attendees. Particularly noteworthy was a Dec. 1, 1941, order by Heinrich Himmler that, Irving said, apparently was issued following a stern rebuke by Hitler because of an unauthorized mass shooting of Jews the day before near Riga, Latvia, including several hundred Jews who had just arrived by train from Germany.

Writing to SS General Jeckeln, the SS and Police Leader for the large *Ostland* region that encompassed the Baltic lands and Belarus, Himmler ordered: “The Jews resettled in the *Ostland* region are to be treated only in accord with the guidelines laid down by me or by the Reich Security Main Office. I will punish those who act on their own authority or in contravention [of the guidelines].”

Irving reported on his legal and financial struggles

in an off-camera talk given on Monday. Even when speaking about the courtroom defeats in his well-publicized libel lawsuit against Deborah Lipstadt and her British publisher, the historian struck a confident and upbeat tone. He also spoke eagerly about his forthcoming legal battle against Gitta Sereny, whom he is suing for libel.

As if to prove his vitality and endurance in spite of legal setbacks, freshly-printed copies of the long-awaited second volume of Irving's *Churchill's War* trilogy were available for sale.

Weber's Address

The first guest speaker to address the conference was IHR director Mark Weber. In his Friday evening lecture, he expressed particular appreciation for the opportunity to address, for the first time, a meeting hosted by Irving, especially given that he has had the honor of introducing Irving at a number of IHR meetings over the years. He also recalled his first meeting with Irving 22 years ago at the National Archives in Washington, DC.

Taking aim at the incessantly repeated Six Million figure of alleged wartime Jewish "Holocaust" victims, Weber pointed out that even before the end of the war, this figure was already a feature of Allied war propaganda. At the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal of 1945-46, Weber noted, the *only* basis for the familiar Six Million figure was the dubious November 1945 affidavit of Wilhelm Höttl, a one-time SS intelligence officer.

Weber went on to examine, and discredit, the flawed methodology and deficient evidence presented by Holocaust historians to support the Six Million figure, and he cited evidence to support reasonable estimates of between one and two million Jewish wartime deaths.

One attendee was so impressed with the address that he donated \$1,000 to the IHR.

Other conference speakers included:

- Tony Martin, professor of African-American studies at Wellesley College in Massachusetts, spoke about the Jewish role in the trans-Atlantic slave trade. He related how he came under tremendous fire for dealing with this emotion-laden subject in his classroom courses. It was the Jewish Talmud, Martin argued, that first provided (allegedly) divine authority for the contention that the slave status of blacks was ordained by God.
- Phillip Supina, professor of history at Shippensburg

University of Pennsylvania, reviewed Third Reich Germany's progressive policies in the fields of environmental protection, forestry management, humane treatment of animals, and public health. These measures, he related, were the most comprehensive and advanced in the world at the time.

- Joseph Sobran, well-known conservative columnist and author, spoke on "Lincoln, the Democrat Monarch." His after-dinner talk, sparkling with insights and observations collected in researching a forthcoming book, was delivered during a river boat cruise.
- Michael A. Hoffman II, independent revisionist writer, showed an impressive knowledge of Jewish religious doctrine and history in his address, in which he detailed the hatred by Deborah Lipstadt and others like her for those whom they regard as enemies of the Jewish people. Lipstadt and other Jewish activists, he noted, have repeatedly compared Irving and other non-conformist historians to "Amalek," the Old Testament-derived personification of the eternal enemy of the Jews. (Hoffman's own report on the Irving conference is posted on his web site: www.hoffman-info.com)
- Douglas Christie, Canadian attorney and prominent civil liberties activist, gave a passionate address in defense of freedom of speech. In his after-dinner address, he reviewed a number of important free speech battles in which he had been involved, including the headline-making cases of Doug Collins and Ernst Zündel. Following Christie's talk, attendees were treated to a spectacular riverside Labor Day fireworks display.
- Peter Kirstein, professor of history at St. Xavier University (Chicago), provided an informative and eloquently delivered talk on the background and meaning of the August 1945 US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
- *Triumph of the Will*, the well-known film documentary of the 1934 National Socialist party congress in Nuremberg, was shown on Saturday afternoon. This path-breaking film work was made by the legendary Leni Riefenstahl, whose 99th birthday was on August 22.

Provan-Renk Debate

Two independent researchers, Charles Provan of Pennsylvania and Brian Renk of British Columbia, squared off on Sunday for a lively debate about wartime

mass killings in gas chambers in the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp.

Much of the debate focused on some apparent holes in the ruins of the collapsed roof of morgue cellar (*Leichenkeller*) 1 at Birkenau crematorium (*Krema*) II. Both Provan and Renk presented enlarged transparency photos of these crude holes, with steel reinforcement bars (rebars) sticking out. Provan argued that these holes are the remains of carefully and deliberately made openings for pouring in Zyklon B to kill trapped Jews inside, while Renk expressed the view that these are merely coincidental holes that resulted from the explosive blowing up of the structure in 1945.

To most attendees these jagged openings did not appear to have been carefully or conscientiously constructed. For example, none of the holes seemed to have a straight edge or smooth finish, which one would expect if they had been designed and built as an openings for pouring in Zyklon.

Provan readily acknowledged that many claims about Auschwitz are empty propaganda. He even expressed the view that the holes shown on enlargements of 1944 Allied aerial reconnaissance photographs of morgue cellar (LK) 1 at *Krema* II were drawn in, which suggests tampering with photographic evidence.

Provan and Renk also discussed the wartime investigations, and the postwar testimonies, of Konrad Morgen, an SS investigator whose bureau carried out hundreds of judicial inquiries into murder and other abuses in the wartime camps. Morgen and his SS colleagues brought some 400 fellow officers to trial, of whom 200 were punished. Five SS camp commandants were arrested, and two were put to death for their crimes.

With Irving's permission, Weber briefly contributed to the debate. He noted that, as even anti-revisionist researcher Jean-Claude Pressac has acknowledged, the Birkenau crematory structures were woefully, even laughably, unsuitable and inappropriate as facilities for mass killings. *Kremas* II and III, Weber continued, were constructed in late 1942 and early 1943, and completed between March and late June 1943 — that is, months after a decision had supposedly been made to kill hundreds of thousands of Jews in these facilities.

The official story these days, he went on, is that these *Kremas* were built as ordinary crematory facilities with morgues, but were later modified or adapted to serve as mass killing facilities. As Pressac has further acknowledged, not only *Kremas* II and III, but also

Kremas IV and V, which were built even later, were not designed or built as mass killing facilities, and were at best only very awkwardly suited for this purpose.

Weber also spoke about Konrad Morgen, about whom he had testified at some length in the second, 1988 Zündel trial in Toronto. Weber related his feeling of awe upon reading for the first time, at the National Archives in Washington, the original indictment brief drawn up by Morgen against Buchenwald commandant Karl Koch, who was executed by the SS for murder and corruption. Weber stressed that Himmler sanctioned Morgen's investigation and prosecution of camp commandants, even for murder of inmates. This included Morgen's investigation of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss. Weber stressed the difficulty of reconciling Morgen's work with a German extermination program.

A set of ten video cassette recordings of the conference addresses are available for sale for \$130, including shipping, through Irving's "Focal Point" web site: <http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/index.html> Also on this site is additional information about the meeting, including a few color photographs.

Trieste Meeting: 'Revisionism and Dignity'

In Europe, revisionists met in Trieste under the auspices of the Nuovo Ordine Nazionale last October 6-7. Civilized Italy has lagged behind northern Europe in making it a crime to doubt the prescribed (and imposed) history, and speakers from four different continents were on hand to question and discuss questions ranging from Mussolini's unsuccessful diplomacy for peace in 1939 to the background of the 9/11 attacks and their implications for policy, and above all the attempts to involve the West in a world struggle against the Muslim nations. Theme of the conference: "Revisionism and Dignity of the Defeated Countries."

Two French educators, each of whom has lost his job for questioning shibboleths of the Second World War and the Holocaust, told how their confrontation with the Holocaust cost them their careers. Former high-school teacher Jean-Louis Berger related how telling his students that dead inmates from Nordhausen shown in a well-known photograph had not been exterminated by Germans but rather killed in an Allied bombing raid. This, and other demonstrable facts revealed to his class, sufficed to get Berger convicted as well as drummed out

of the national teaching corps. The fact that Berger had run for office as a candidate of the National Front, whose leader, Jean-Marie Le Pen, several years ago received a huge fine for stating that the gas chambers were a “detail” of the history of the Second World War, only heightened the media hysteria.

Vincent Reynouard was hunted from his position at a technical school, and banned from the state educational system, for his extracurricular activities in historical research and writing. He reminded attendees of some realities of Weimar and interwar Austria, including the propensity of governments before Hitler’s to suspend constitutional guarantees in emergencies, and the demand for union with Germany in Austria’s post-Saint Germain constitution. Reynouard also discussed the Duce’s efforts to mediate peace between France, England, and Germany in October 1939, which the Allies rebuffed.

Ahmed Rami, who spoke at IHR’s eleventh conference in 1992, noted that, thanks to “the gigantic bluff of the Holocaust,” Jews have more rights in Western nations than do their ancestral peoples. The former Moroccan officer, in exile for many years after trying to overthrow his country’s corrupt and despotic monarch, called for Muslims to return from their diaspora throughout the Christian world to “liberate, develop, and democratize” their homelands. Rami further urged rejection of efforts by Israel and its outriders abroad to promote a clash of civilizations between Muslims and Christians.

Two more hard cases of Holocaust denial, Jürgen Graf and Fred Töben, each of whom has addressed an IHR conference, discussed the search for historical truth about the Holocaust and its consequences. Graf put the case for a figure of 300,000, not Six Million, Jewish victims, and reviewed Holocaust atrocity accusations, forgotten and remembered, in the light of similar propaganda charges of the twentieth century. Graf is currently seeking refuge from his native Switzerland, where he has been sentenced for historical heresy. Dr. Töben, convicted in German court for his Internet postings from Australia, tied the falsehoods of the Holocaust to current manipulations of the truth. He reminded of one fact seemingly destined for the memory hole: that Osama bin Laden “is a creation of Washington, of the CIA” (no wonder he’ll never stand trial in open court!).

Two Americans well known to IHR supporters rounded out the conference. Dr. Robert Countess, advi-

sor to this journal, gave the talk he had planned for the Beirut conference. The retired professor asked pointedly why Israel’s crimes against Palestine weren’t being judged by Nuremberg standards, and exhorted the Muslim world to embrace revisionism. Proud Sicilian-American Russ Granata, lecturing at the Boot’s other end, speculated on what the Israeli and American secret services knew about the 9/11 attacks in advance.

As if the presence of dangerous “deniers,” Muslim extremists, and a potential anthrax-spreading doctor of divinity weren’t enough, the gathering was under the auspices of a (quite legal) “fascist” group. Evidently some revisionists avoided the conference out of philosophical distaste for its organizers, or from a general aversion to political associations, or other prudent considerations. Italian Fascism remains the most innocuous of the major authoritarian movements of its era, and in any case the participation of successor parties to Mussolini’s in postwar Italian governments without noticeable calamity seems to be diminishing the power of the “fascist” stigma.

In Other Journals

The July-September 2001 issue of the French journal *Vingtième Siècle* includes a useful, if gingerly, refutation of a canard that has resurfaced long after it was hatched at Nuremberg: the claim that Himmler had stated that he planned to starve thirty million Slavs in connection with the Russian campaign. This accusation, part of the testimony of prosecution witness (and former SS general) Erich von dem Bach Zelewski, had been long forgotten, but has been recently revived by several German historians (surprising no one), including Christian Gerlach, Suzanne Heim, and Götz Aly. Jean Stengers, professor of history at the University of Brussels, easily shows that there is not even a whisper of truth to the claim. His treatment of comments by Rosenberg and Göring that have been adduced to bolster the spurious Himmler remarks shows that their words fall well short of expressing such a plan. Stengers, doubtless wary of Europe’s Holocaust police, is extravagantly polite to Gerlach and company and takes many pains to underscore his allegiance to the alleged Jewish genocide. (*Vingtième Siècle* is published by Presses de Sciences PO, 44 rue du Four, 75006 Paris, France.)

John E. Moser, visiting assistant professor at the University of Georgia, offers a rare even-handed look at

“The 1941 Senate Investigation of Hollywood” in the summer 2001 issue of *The Historian* (vol. 63, no. 4). Moser shows that the anti-interventionist senators, led by Burton K. Wheeler (D-Montana), who investigated an upsurge of anti-German propaganda films that began in 1940, were not motivated by crude anti-Semitism. In fact, examining the movie industry was well within the purview of Senator Wheeler’s Interstate Commerce Committee, which had aggressively investigated other areas of big business in the 1920s and ‘30s, in line with the progressivism of Wheeler and his colleagues. Moser suggests that the committee, while it did not ignore the pervasive role of Jews in Hollywood, was not notably anti-Semitic. While the investigation, begun in September 1941, came to little, and America was moved stealthily and steadily into war, the records of its inquiry into anti-German and pro-British filmmaking doubtless merit study. (*The Historian* is published quarterly from 301 Morrill Hall, Michigan State University, Lansing, MI 48824-1036.)

The September 2001 issue of *The Historical Journal* contains an informative article on the vexed question of English and Irish fascism by John Newsinger of Bath Spa University College. Newsinger is at pains to stress the radical and anti-Jewish nature of Oswald Mosley’s British Union of Fascists in the 1930s, rejecting Mosley biographer Robert Skidelsky’s more temperate evaluation in his 1981 *Oswald Mosley*). Considering whether Eoin O’Duffy’s National Guard (or Blueshirts), were genuinely fascist, rather than authoritarian conservatives, he leans toward the former, which seems to strain the evidence. If fascists they were, Duffy and most of his followers surely inclined more to Francoism than the values of the Falange of José Antonio Primo de Rivera. Newsinger also takes a brief look at the role of the Blueshirts in the nationalist ranks during the Spanish Civil War, as well as a peek at the Irish Christian Front, which played a leading role prominent in Irish politics in the late 1930s, and in which Father Denis Fahey, author of *The Rulers of Russia*, was a leading activist. (*The Historical Journal* is published quarterly by Cambridge University.)

In the May 2001 issue of *Irish Historical Studies*, Andreas Roth examines the radio broadcasts that Irish poet and novelist (in English and Irish) Francis Stuart made from Berlin to his home country in 1942-44. Roth finds that Stuart, who lectured on Anglo-Irish literature at the University of Berlin while in Germany, advocated a united, neutral Ireland while attacking the tyranny of

finance, but rarely touched on the Jewish question, and was in general successful in resisting German pressure to put a sharper edge to his broadcasts. The effect of his broadcasts on the Irish is not known, but cannot have been powerful. Unlike his one-time countryman William Joyce, Stuart was not punished after the war: his citizenship was incontestably Irish, and his country had been neutral. Stuart is still alive and his writings continue to draw interest; several years ago he made something of a stir when an Irish television documentary quoted him as saying that “the Jew was the always the worm that got into the rose and sickened it.” (*Irish Historical Studies*, Department of History, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland.)

Was Holocaust Survivor Viktor Frankl Gassed at Auschwitz?

A recent article has revealed that Viktor Frankl, the famous psychiatrist and emblematic Auschwitz survivor, greatly embroidered on his meager time at Auschwitz. This news casts a shadow over the veracity of Frankl’s famous memoir, *Man’s Search for Meaning*. Of even more interest, however, is a question that arises when considering the Auschwitz State Museum’s records regarding Frankl’s time at Birkenau: Was Viktor Frankl gassed at Auschwitz?

Few men who emerged from the camps can match the late Viktor Frankl for acclaim. A psychiatrist from Vienna who died in 1997, Frankl gained international renown for the theories of mental health he expounded through his psychiatric school, logotherapy. Inextricably bound up with Frankl’s fame, teachings, and moral authority was his experience of the German concentration camps, above all Auschwitz, as described in *Man’s Search for Meaning* (U.S., 1959) a worldwide bestseller that has been ranked as one of the ten most influential books of the twentieth century by the Library of Congress.

In his reminiscence, Frankl recounted his stay at Auschwitz as if it had lasted an eternity. Now comes Timothy Pytell, adjunct professor of history at the Cooper Union in New York City, to inform us that, based on his researches for an intellectual biography of Frankl, the celebrated survivor spent at most three days at Auschwitz, while in transit from Theresienstadt in Bohemia to a subcamp of Dachau in October 1944. As

Pytell observes, a reader of *Man's Search for Meaning* would "be stunned to discover that Frankl spent only a few days in Auschwitz." In the book, Frankl devotes some thirty pages to Auschwitz. Besides recording his experiences on arrival (shaving, showering, delousing, etc.), Frankl makes observations about the lot of inmates there that strongly imply that, at the very least, he spent months, not days, at the camp. ("We had to wear the same shirts for half a year, until they had lost all appearance of being shirts.") As Pytell writes of Frankl's depiction of his stay at Auschwitz: "But if truth be told, Frankl's rendition is contradictory and profoundly deceptive."

Pytell notes that Frankl was transferred from Theresienstadt on October 19, 1944, on a train that carried 1500 persons to Auschwitz, and that the prisoner's log of the Dachau sub-camp Kaufering III records Frankl's arrival on October 25, 1944. Indeed, Frankl himself told the American evangelist Robert Schuller, in an interview published in Schuller's magazine *Possibilities* (March-April 1991): "I was in Auschwitz only three or four days ... I was sent to a barrack and we were all transported to a camp in Bavaria." Thus the credibility of yet another star survivor has been tested and found wanting. Like the testimony of Miklos Nyiszli, Filip Müller, Rudolf Vrba, Mel Mermelstein, and a host of other eyewitness oracles, Viktor Frankl's Auschwitz stories are now an embarrassment to the Holocaust industry, rather than an indictment of the Germans.

There's more, however. While Pytell wasn't up to examining the implications of Frankl's stay at Auschwitz for the reliability of the camp's official history, records compiled by exterminationist researcher of Theresienstadt H. G. Adler and by the Auschwitz State Museum make clear that if Frankl arrived at Auschwitz on October 20, 1944, he must have left Theresienstadt on a train with 1,500 passengers, designated "Es." The English-language edition of the supposedly authoritative *Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-45* (editor Danuta Czech, London: I.B.Tauris, 1990), based on material from the Auschwitz State Museum, reports of that train:

October 20

1,500 Jewish men, women, and children are sent in an RSHA transport from the ghetto in Theresienstadt. After the selection, 169 women are admitted to the transit camp and 173 men as prisoners to the camp. The men receive Nos. B-13307-B-13479. The remaining 1,158 people

are killed in the gas chamber of Crematorium III.

Now, while Viktor Frankl reports at length in his chatty memoir about his reception at Auschwitz (including the obligatory brush with Dr. Mengele), he says not a word about being registered, assigned a number, tattooed with that number, or transferred to the Auschwitz Stammlager, the permanent camp). Thus one can conclude that he was not admitted as a prisoner to the camp. And the *Chronicle's* entry speaks of no surviving, non-registered persons from that shipment. Ergo, according to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, and the records on which it claims to be based, Viktor Frankl must have gassed nearly fifty-three years before his widely announced death in September 1997. Who was it, then, who was sent out of Auschwitz a few days later, and went on to write all those books?

As Robert Faurisson, Carlo Mattogno, Enrique Aynat Eknes, Jürgen Graf, and other revisionist researchers have made plain, there is a way out of this seeming quandary. The survival of Frankl, like the survival of sundry other persons counted dead by the record keepers at the Auschwitz State Museum — most notably French and Euro-politician Simone Veil — was due, not to some miraculous intervention, but to the sloppy and dishonest researches of the Auschwitz authorities. Despite recent revisions in the *Chronicle* that allow for the survival of some non-registered inmates, the widely consulted reference continues to consign, more or less automatically, arrivals not officially assigned to the Auschwitz camp to the gas chambers.

No doubt if the Auschwitz records were open to a thorough revisionist combing, we would learn of many more survivors who are counted, officially, as gassed. Needless to say, such life-affirming findings are entirely unwelcome to the Holocaust industrialists, whether at the Auschwitz State Museum, or the Red Cross's international tracing center at Arolsen, Germany, or at Yad Vashem in Israel. And — who knows? — stating that Viktor Frankl wasn't gassed might earn one a fine, or a prison sentence, in more than one "democracy."

Ignorance gives politicians a free hand to exploit the politics of envy. Our education system creates a growing surplus of that ignorance.

—Walter E. Williams

Unmasking Zionism's Most Dangerous Myths

In this headline-making work, a prominent French scholar delivers one powerful blow after another to the pernicious historical myths cited for decades to justify Zionist aggression and repression, including the Israeli legend of a "land without people for a people without land," and the most sacred of Jewish-Zionist icons, the Holocaust extermination story.

For financial gain, as an alibi for indefensible policies, and for other reasons, Jews have used what the author calls "theological myths" to arrogate for themselves a "right of theological divine chosenness." The wartime suffering of Europe's Jews, he contends, has been elevated to the status of a secular religion, and is now treated with sacrosanct historical uniqueness.

This readable, thoroughly documented study examines the brutal dispossession and mass expulsion of Palestine's Arabs, exposes the farce of the Nuremberg victors' show trial, and shows that the notorious German "final solution" term referred to a "territorial" program of resettlement, not extermination. *Founding Myths* details the secret collaboration of prominent Jews with the young Nazi regime, and the 1941 offer by some Zionists, including a future Israeli prime minister, to join Hitler's Germany in a military alliance against Britain. The author presents a frank assessment of the powerful Jewish-Zionist lobby in the United States, showing


how it effectively controls US policy regarding Israel, and plays a crucial role in shaping American public opinion.

For decades Roger Garaudy was prominent in the French Communist Party, making a name for himself as a Communist deputy in the French National Assembly, and as a leading Marxist intellectual and theoretician. Later he broke with Communism, eventually becoming a Muslim.

When *Founding Myths* first appeared in France, it touched off a storm of controversy among intellectuals and a furious uproar in the media. Soon Garaudy was charged with violating France's notorious Gaysot law, which makes it a crime to "contest" the "crimes against humanity" as defined by the Nuremberg Tribunal of 1945-46. A Paris court found him guilty and fined him \$40,000. His trial and conviction for Holocaust heresy prompted wide international support, above all from across the Arab and Muslim world.

Relying on a vast range of Zionist, Soviet, American and German source references, this well-documented study is packed with hundreds of eye-opening quotations, many by prominent Jewish scholars and personalities.

Here, at last, this important work is available in a handsome, professionally edited English-language edition, with a valuable foreword by Theodore J. O'Keefe.



The Founding Myths of Modern Israel by Roger Garaudy

Quality soft-cover. 230 pages. Source references. Index. (#0246) \$13.95, plus \$2 shipping.

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Machinations of the Anti-Defamation League

PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, JR.

YOU MIGHT WONDER why a man would leave northern California and come to southern California in the middle of a lovely weekend. I came because I respect the thesis of this organization — the thesis being that there should be a reexamination of whatever governments say or politicians say or political entities say. I was in politics for fifteen years, and I think you should start with the assumption: never trust a politician.

In 1964 I was on active duty in the Marine Corps over at Camp Pendleton, a few miles from here. I was then leading a Marine Corps Reserve officer class studying counter-insurgency. It was during that time that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was enacted by Congress [August 7, 1964], and you may remember that the Secretary of State [Dean Rusk] and the Secretary of Defense [Robert McNamara] came before Congress and said that [North Vietnamese] torpedo boats had attacked two U.S. destroyers, the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy*. The Congress voted nearly unanimously to authorize the President to go to war in Vietnam, one of the most tragic mistakes that we ever made. The two men I fought under in Korea, General MacArthur and General Ridgeway, both said: Never again fight a land war on the Asian continent; it is not a place for Americans. Nevertheless we went to war, and a great American, Senator William Fulbright, said it is the responsi-

bility of the politician to lead in the reexamination both of policy and in historical fact, which is exactly the thesis of this organization. Because if you're going to make policy decisions, you need to know what the facts are.

You may remember when Lyndon Johnson announced [March 31, 1968] that he would not run for a second term as president. For some years he had told everyone in the Congress that we were doing the right thing in Vietnam: that we had to bring the coonskin home because we couldn't afford to be, as President Nixon put it, a "pitiful, helpless giant." We had to win that war, he said, and for a long time he was convinced, based on his daily briefings, that we were winning the war.

One of my friends from Stanford law school, and my debate partner in the moot court debates there in 1950, was John Ehrlichman. Years later, when he went to prison in 1975, I asked John what had caused a fine, honest lawyer to become a corrupt servant to President Nixon and to lie to the Congress. And I asked him why Henry Kissinger had been making the foreign policy of the United States, rather than the Secretary of State, William Rogers, who by law was entrusted with that responsibility. And he told me: "Pete, it's this way. Every morning at seven o'clock Richard Nixon gets his briefing of events around the world. There were briefings

Paul N. "Pete" McCloskey, Jr., was born and raised in California. During Korean War service with the Marine Corps, he earned the Navy Cross, the Silver Star and two Purple Hearts. From 1967 to 1983 he served as a U.S. congressman. He was co-chairman of the First Earth Day, 1970. He was an early opponent of American involvement in the Vietnam War, and the first Republican in Congress to call for the impeachment of President Nixon. In 1972 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Republican party presidential nomination. For more about McCloskey's contentious relationship with the Jewish-Zionist lobby, see Paul Findley's book, *They Dare to Speak Out*. This essay is adapted from McCloskey's address at the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000.



Pete McCloskey addresses the 13th IHR Conference in Irvine, California, May 28, 2000.

from State, Defense, and the CIA, but we couldn't trust any of those three agencies because the warfare amongst them was greater than their desire to tell the truth to the President of the United States. Therefore, Kissinger became the censor of those three reports. He took and collated the State, Defense and CIA reports, so that the President got a single briefing from Henry Kissinger. Well, Kissinger's policies being what they were, you can imagine what that could do to the policy of the United States."

Free speech and civil courage

Earlier here today I listened to speeches about the courage of men in France, Britain, Germany, and New Zealand who have spoken out against the commonly accepted concept of what occurred during the Second World War in the so-called Holocaust. And I wanted to tell you a story that every American ought to know, because we do have free speech in this country, and a judicial system with the right to jury trial. Whatever you may think of the ability of given judges, or the ability of given members of the press, the independent judiciary and press have saved us from the kind of things that have been described here today in Germany or Britain or Canada.

I remember that one time, during a visit to New Zealand, a radio talk show host there commented that, based on statistics, four percent of the one hundred men in New Zealand's Parliament would be homosexual, which meant that four members of Parliament could be homosexual. Well, they hauled this talk show

host up in front of a parliamentary committee and threatened to lock him up and throw away the key for contempt of Parliament. He whined and whimpered, and said, "I didn't mean to say four members of the parliament are homosexual, but that's just the statistics, and if they are a representative sample of the population, four would be homosexual." With his apology and humbling, they let him go. Within six months, three members of the New Zealand Parliament admitted they were homosexual.

But it's different in America. How many of you know the story of John Peter Zenger? If you reexamine history, and go back to 1733-1735 in New York, the royal governor of this British colony was a man named William Cosby. And a very brave editor, John Peter Zenger — maybe the David McCalden or the Mark Weber of his time — came out and said in his paper that "Cosby is corrupt. He's taking money from the royal treasury. The government is corrupt, and the governor is corrupt." He was hauled up for trial [on a charge of seditious libel]. In keeping with English common law, he had a right to a jury trial, and the chief justice in the case instructed the jury, twelve men tried and true: "You must find John Peter Zenger guilty because he has criticized the government. It is important and essential to the preservation of government that people have a good opinion of it. Therefore, you must find him guilty." [Zenger's lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, argued that because what Zenger had written was true, he should be acquitted.] Well, the jury took about twenty minutes to acquit Zenger. As a result, when we later adopted our Bill of Rights [1791], we put into it two essential rights: the right of free speech and free press, and the right of trial by jury. And that has generally protected people in this country in expressing whatever dissenting views they cared to express — from everything except the scorn of their peers in the same field.

I may not agree with you about everything I've heard today, or what you might feel, but your right to say what you believe and to research things that are alleged as true, and to try to disprove them, is perhaps the most important part of our democracy.

That's what we're up against now with the Anti-Defamation League, and I think ultimately we're going to win. When you think about those rights — which they don't have in Canada or Britain or New Zealand or France or Germany, where people can go to jail for expressing unpopular thoughts — thank God we're Americans.

Reactive repression

Let me go back now to the ADL — after all, this speech is entitled “Machinations of the ADL” — and let me tell you a little about my experiences. I’m a fourth generation Californian. My father and both grandfathers were lawyers here in southern California. I grew up in a little town called San Marino, a classic all-white suburb. The last I heard there were 9,000 voters, 8,700 of them Republicans. There were no blacks in San Marino, and there were no Jews. They kept Jews out of San Marino by asking, “What’s the maiden name of your mother?” The real estate people had a conspiracy. As with blacks, Jews in your neighborhood were supposed to make property values drop.

My father was a member of a law firm called Horwitz & McCloskey, which was on Spring Street in downtown Los Angeles when that was the city’s legal center. I remember once when I was a boy, he said, “Son, we Irish need the Jews. We have half of the good traits of mankind and half of the bad ones, and the Jews are exactly the opposite. They’ve got the good traits where we’re weak, and they have the weak traits where we’re strong.” I’ve always remembered that.

Anyway, in 1960 I was the president of the Palo Alto Bar Association. The next year I was elected president of the California Conference of Barristers. (That’s all lawyers in the state under 36 years of age.) That year Proposition 13, which some of you may remember, came up for a vote in California. Very simply it read: “A person shall have the right to sell or rent his home to whomever he chooses.” Sounds good. What that means in practice, however, is that a person is free to discriminate against anybody that he doesn’t like because of race or some other reason. The state Bar convention had never taken a position on political initiatives, but that year we felt that because we were constitutional lawyers, and because this initiative was clearly unconstitutional, the Bar ought to speak out.

Three of us addressed the conference, arguing that the Bar Association should take a position on this matter of constitutional interest. We got a lawyer in his late seventies named Herman Selvin — a tax lawyer with a famous Jewish firm in Los Angeles called Loeb & Loeb — to make the concluding speech. At the end of his marvelous, very persuasive speech, he said, “We lawyers have shown we’ve got great minds, and we’ve got great hearts. Now let’s show we have some guts.” And the Bar Convention, 3,000 people, voted two-to-one to take a position against Proposition 13. But it proved useless, because the people of California voted two-to-



Roy Bullock worked for more than thirty years in San Francisco and Los Angeles as a spy for the Anti-Defamation League, collecting information for the Jewish-Zionist organization on individuals and groups deemed contrary to Jewish interests. The ADL paid Bullock covertly through a Jewish attorney in Beverly Hills. Bullock’s undercover work for the ADL was revealed in the January 1987 *IHR Newsletter*, but was not confirmed in major daily newspapers until late 1992 and early 1993.

one to pass Proposition 13, although later our Supreme Court held it to be unconstitutional.

Well, after he had given his speech at the convention, we took Herman Selvin out for a beer, and we complimented him, as young lawyers will an elderly sage. He told us that anti-Semitism was alive and well. A friend of his, he went on, had invited him to the posh Montecito Country Club in Santa Barbara, but when they got to the door, there was a man in a tuxedo who looked down a list and then said: “Selvin. We don’t take Jews here.” Now that was in 1963! In my own lifetime, this state has had a long record of anti-Semitism.

And what do people do when they’re discriminated against? They form networks. By June 1967, when the Six Day War occurred, the Jewish communities in America had built up a large network of mutual support in the synagogues and the Jewish community centers.

At that time there were thirty-three major Jewish organizations. One of them was the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which became the most militant voice for Israel. To be a good Jew meant that you had to support Israel. It was as if "Israel über Alles," or "Israel above all," became the watchword of the ADL.

Stifling debate

They built up an intelligence organization to learn about their enemies. There were people like Roy Bullock, who masqueraded as a kind of rotund antique dealer, at first in the East, and then in the Midwest, before he moved to Los Angeles and then to San Francisco. He would pass himself off as a sympathizer with whatever group the ADL deemed to be hostile to Israel. By the 1980s the ADL's main purpose was no longer to try to stop anti-Semitism and bigotry, but instead to discredit any voice that was hostile to the policies of Israel — and not only to discredit people who spoke out against Israel, but to deny them a forum.

Now, I've always been willing to debate. I once debated Meir Kahane in front of two thousand Jews in San Francisco. I've debated Irv Rubin of the Jewish Defense League. But no ADL leader will debate me on the subject of Israel. If a public television station, for example, wants to organize a debate on the Middle East, they'll first call the ADL to find someone to speak for the Jewish community. Then they'll call for someone on the other side — for example someone from the Council for the National Interest, a group I founded some years ago with [former Illinois Congressman] Paul Findley. But when they call the ADL back to ask, "Will you debate Congressman McCloskey or Senator Percy or Senator Adlai Stevenson?" the answer is always "No, no." If there is a skilled speaker on the other side, they refuse to debate. The ADL does not want the facts to come out. They want to suppress any facts that are critical of Israel. You must understand that that's their goal. Above all else, they want to preserve the "special relationship" between Israel and the United States; preserve a good public opinion of Israel on the part of the American people, so that the money keeps coming; defeat any political figure, such as Paul Findley or Chuck Percy or even Ed Zschau, who was defeated mainly by Jewish money in his bid for the Senate here in California.

The ADL's purpose is to discredit and to deny a forum to anybody who might jeopardize the Israel-U.S. relationship. So of course the IHR is a major bull's-eye target. Now, given the extensive intelligence organization they've built up, I am almost certain that someone

in this room is reporting to the ADL. Roy Bullock, for example, would go to the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee and say "I'm in sympathy. Let me pass out your literature." But this was only a masquerade.

My wife was once working in San Francisco on behalf of something called Proposition W, which called for cutting aid to Israel by the amount of money they were putting into the settlements on the West Bank and Gaza. So of course she got listed; she became targeted because she was taking a view hostile to Israel. I got a call from a police captain, who said: "Mr. McCloskey, in the records of the San Francisco ADL is a note that when your wife crossed from Jordan into Israel in 1987, she was involved in an altercation at the Allenby Bridge." Well, I was with her at the time, along with Jim Abourezk, the Arab-American senator from South Dakota. We had visited Jordan, and my wife wanted to go across and see Jerusalem and Jericho. All in all there were five young women, in their 20s and early 30s, who were crossing the bridge. The Jewish border guard stopped them. My wife, with a name like McCloskey, or Smith or Jones: No problem. But one of the girls was named Aziz, that is, she had an Arab name. She had married a young Arab-American. All five were American citizens. The Israeli border guard turned to the one named Aziz and said, "Take off your clothes." It was a humiliating, demeaning experience. My wife was offended, and she spoke up about her feelings. But to find that turning up six years later in the office of the San Francisco Anti-Defamation League meant that information was going from Israel to the United States, as well as from the U.S. to Israel. Victor Ostrovsky, a former Israeli Mossad case worker, has written [in his book, *By Way of Deception*] about the cooperation of American Jews with the Israeli government.

The ADL would ingratiate itself with police departments so that they could get information about anti-Semitic or anti-Israel activity. Roy Bullock, the ADL spy, would come to a meeting like this one, and after sitting down, would go out to the parking lot and take down the license plate numbers of all the cars parked there. And then he would take the numbers to Tom Gerard at the San Francisco Police Department and ask: "Would you get me the names of these people?" And back would come the names and the addresses of the people who owned the cars parked at the meeting, along with a notation that these people are "anti-Israel" or "pro-Palestinian," or that they're Vietnam war "peaceniks." And that information would be passed on the ADL office in Los Angeles or New York or Washing-

ton, DC. Even Portland, Oregon, might get it. The 31 ADL offices, in major U.S. cities, as well as in Israel, were in constant communication with each other. The ADL compiled detailed dossiers, so that if one wanted to find out if such and such a person was anti-Israel, or had ever said anything that was anti-Israel, the ADL was able to quickly respond with a “No” or a “Yes,” which would condemn you.

Marked man

Until 1980, when I first spoke out against Israel, I had been known as a relative friend of Israel. On issues like Vietnam or a woman’s right of choice, things of that kind, I shared views with most Jews. But once I took a position that was deemed hostile to the state of Israel, including opposition to Israel’s 1982 invasion of Lebanon and its use of cluster bombs, I was a marked man.

Let me tell you what happened when, after 15 years in the House, I came back to California in 1982 to run for the U.S. Senate. Here’s an example: My finance chairman in southern California was a savings and loan company executive. He was a very loyal man. He’d known my father, and he wanted to help me. He thought I’d make a good senator. In 1982, you may remember, there was a savings and loan crisis. Three of his biggest Jewish depositors came to him and said, “Mr. X, we see you’re the chairman of McCloskey’s finance committee. You get off that committee, or we will withdraw our deposits.”

In the 1982 primary election race I lost the Republican party nomination for the U.S. Senate to Pete Wilson. He went up to the San Fernando Valley and made a promise to the Jewish leaders of that powerful Jewish area that if elected to the Senate he would favor Israel’s annexation of the West Bank and Gaza. That story was reported, but then absolutely hushed up. You’ve never heard the story since. The Jewish community has the power to suppress, either by advertising or control of the media, news reports that are hostile to Israel, and they have the ability to discredit anyone who speaks out. And that’s their purpose.

I’m going to give you a couple of examples of what they’ve done to friends or clients of mine to achieve their goal of protecting the good public image of Israel. In 1983 two young women, Carol Al Shahib and Audrey Shabbas, who were wives of Arab professors at San Jose State University and the University of California, had organized a small educational program to educate people about Arab culture and Muslim culture. They put on seminars and taught people about Middle East his-

tory. They quickly came under the eye of the ADL as threats to Israel because they had spoken about justice for Palestinians. When a Saudi Arabian art exhibit came to San Jose, they signed a contract with the San Jose Museum of Art to host the exhibit. This foundation was run by twenty-one of the community’s leading citizens. The chairman happened to be Jewish. Carol and Audrey also scheduled two speakers, one of them a lady from Texas who had spoken on behalf of Palestinian rights.

One of the foundation’s board members thought he recognized the name of the speaker, and he called the local ADL representative, William Brinner, a famous professor at the University of California (Berkeley). And Brinner said, “Those people are anti-Israel.” The two women had invested about \$5,000 to put on this four-day exhibition, and had sent out letters to all the local school teachers. Called up in front of the board, they were told that the speakers were controversial, and that the exhibition would have to be cancelled. These two women would perhaps have made maybe \$15,000 from the seminar, probably paying half or two-thirds of that amount in expenses. So the ADL effectively ended their ability to earn a living by teaching people about the Arab world.

Liberty Denial

My second story begins during the Six Day War in June 1967. An American navy ship called the USS *Liberty* was sailing off the coast of Egypt and Gaza, well outside the three-mile limit. It was a radio antenna ship. You can call it a spy ship. It had a crew of 294 seamen and officers commanded by Captain William McGonagle. In the early morning of June 8, 1967, the ship was flying a big American flag. A fellow named Jim Ennes, who was a lieutenant and officer of the deck, had run up an American flag so big you could see it for miles. They were under surveillance by flights of Israeli jets, not once but twice. But in the early afternoon, Israeli jet fighters roared in and strafed and machine-gunned the ship, knocking out all of the antennas. Israel torpedo boats came out and launched a torpedo into the *Liberty*.

Nearly everyone on deck was killed or wounded. Out of a crew of 294, there were 34 killed and 171 wounded, the greatest number of casualties on a U.S. naval ship since Okinawa. The ship started to go down, and they put out life boats. Israeli torpedo boats directed machine-gun fire at the life boats. Obviously they intended that there be no survivors.

Captain McGonagle was able to save the *Liberty*,



The USS *Liberty* a few days after the devastating June 8, 1967, attack by Israeli war planes and torpedo boats during the Israeli-Arab "Six Day" war. Although it was flying a large American flag, the American Navy spy ship was repeatedly attacked by Zionist forces, killing 34 and wounding 171. The vessel was scarred by napalm, a torpedo explosion at the water line, 3,000 armor-piercing bullets, and 851 rockets. Israeli machine-gun fire destroyed the ship's life rafts. Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, later wrote: "I have never believed that the attack on the USS *Liberty* was a case of mistaken identity. That is ridiculous ... What is so chilling and cold-blooded, of course, is that they [the Israelis] could kill as many Americans as they did in confidence that Washington would cooperate in quelling any public outcry." In a recently published book about the US National Security Agency, *Body of Secrets*, James Bamford cites long-secret recordings of Hebrew-language communications by attacking Israeli planes and ships that discredit the lies that Israel and its defenders have used to conceal its crime against the United States.

which limped back to Malta. The dead were buried. McGonagle took care of the wounded. The Navy gave instructions that the crew was to be separated. No one crew member was to go to the same base, but instead the Navy spread them over ships and stations all around the United States. The *Liberty* crew was awarded a presidential unit citation, but they were never told about it. Captain McGonagle was later given the Congressional Medal of Honor for saving the ship, but he's the only Congressional Medal of Honor winner in history to be given it at the Washington Navy Yard and not at a ceremony at the White House.

Israel claimed that it had all been a terrible mistake, and that their pilots hadn't really seen the American flag. Well, since then individuals have come forward to say "I was in the headquarters on that day. I was a naval reserve officer. Yeah, they knew it was the *USS Liberty*. They had a big American flag on it. They bombed it, strafed it, deliberately."

The story was suppressed for years. Finally, Jim Ennes wrote a book about it, *Assault on the Liberty*, but copies of it began disappearing from libraries. Clearly, there was an effort afoot to silence Jim Ennes's story about the Israeli attack.

Enemies of the Library

There's a small town up in Wisconsin called Grafton, a town of about 10,000 people north of Milwaukee. Two old gentlemen who lived there, Ted and Ben Grob, ran a machine tool shop, which was the most successful business in Grafton. Back during the Depression, when people in Grafton were in trouble, the Grobs could be counted on to help out. They were good people. They were quiet people. They were German.

In 1993 the town's leading citizens decided to build a new library. They called in a professional consultant, who told them "You need two and half million dollars. Okay, first you've got to raise the initial quarter of a million. One-tenth of it. You should raise it from one person, who will start it off so that people have hope that they'll get the full two and half million. And so the first gift has got to be \$250,000, and then ideally you'll get five gifts of \$50,000, and then you go out publicly and put up a big thermometer on the town square. As you get closer and closer to your goal, the thermometer goes up and people get inspired, and finally you put it over the top." And the good people of Grafton asked, "Well, how do we get that first \$250,000?" And the pro says, "Well, it's simple. You agree to name the library after

whoever gives you the \$250,000."

So the Grob brothers gave the first \$250,000, and soon they raised the entire two and a half million. And shortly before the ground-breaking ceremony, the town's leading citizens went to the Grob brothers to ask them how they'd like the library named. Well, these two brothers had been reading the *Spotlight*, which had picked up the story of the *USS Liberty*. (The *Spotlight* used to pillory me regularly. Editorially it was no friend of mine.) And so the Grob brothers replied that they wanted to name it the "USS Liberty Memorial Library."


Well, all hell broke loose. The ADL went right up the wall. They got editorials in the *Milwaukee Journal* and the Chicago papers. By God, it was said, to name a library in memory of a U.S. ship that had been strafed and torpedoed by the Israelis would increase anti-Semitism. The ADL got about a third of the teachers at the Grafton high school to oppose naming the library after the *USS Liberty*. They got the high school valedictorian, a young 17-year-old, to speak in his graduating class address against naming the library after the *USS Liberty*. And all of this was sponsored and pushed by the ADL because of an incredible fear that merely raising the issue of the *USS Liberty* would increase public opinion against Israel. And that's what you're up against.

I don't know whether you're right or wrong about the Holocaust, but anytime a historian takes a position against Israel, that brings down their wrath and concentrated numbers and economic power.

Historical Correctness

Let me tell you another story about a friend of mine named Norman Davies, a man acknowledged around the world as a leading historian on Eastern Europe. He's one of the few historians who can write readable books. One of them is *Europe: A History*, which was a best-seller. You don't often find history books that are best-sellers. Well, I had just gotten out of Congress, and had returned to the practice of law in Palo Alto. (It was a country town when I had left, and now it's a kind of headquarters of Silicon Valley.)

I had been invited to be a guest professor at Stanford, to teach a course on political science. And I was hired in spite of a fierce campaign against me by the Jewish campus group, Hillel, and by the ADL. Well, Norman Davies was scheduled to be named to a prestigious chair at the history department. Stanford has a procedure whereby the department votes on whether or not to approve the appointment. To be appointed a profes-



Bodies of some of the 34 crew members of the *USS Liberty* who were killed in the 1967 Israeli attack are removed while the ship is docked in Malta.

sor at Stanford you have to be at the top of your field. Some twenty-five consultants, called outside referees, were asked about Davies, and all of them agreed that he was among the top one or two who might be considered for this professorship.

Some ten days before the matter came to a vote — it was in December 1983, I think — a history professor at Stanford who was also a member of the ADL contacted the ADL office in San Francisco, and the word then went out to all of the Jewish members of the faculty: “Have you read what Davies wrote about the Jews in Poland” [in his book *God’s Playground: A History of Poland*]? Well, you can’t write a book about Poland without dealing with the Jews, who were a large and important part of the population. In his book Davies had dared to suggest that not all Poles were anti-Semitic. And that ran counter to the view of history held by the Israelis and the Jewish community in the United States; that the Poles were anti-Semitic and they all discriminated against the Jews. Lucy Dawidowicz [Jewish historian] wrote that Davies was, in effect, a revisionist, and that his view of the history of Europe was detrimental to the Jewish community around the world. I’ve talked to a lot of Poles over the years, and I’ve *known* some who didn’t like Jews and I’ve found some that helped Jews. In occupied Poland during the Second World War the Poles who helped Jews were shot by the Nazis if they were caught.

In any event, what Davies wrote was deemed by the ADL to be hostile to Israel because of the simple suggestion that not all Poles were anti-Semitic. But we took them on in a lawsuit, which we lost on appeal. In that case we had a famous psychiatrist examine what Davies had written. Of 52 references he found 26 that one could infer were favorable to the Poles, and 26 critical, and 26 favorable to the Jews, and 26 critical. But that wasn’t enough for the ADL. They circulated a notice to the thirteen history professors who were Jewish, “Be there for the vote.” Now, not all of the thirty-eight history professors came to vote. And when the vote was held, it was thirteen to twelve to deny the chair to Norman Davies. The Jews were happy. The ADL was happy. They had denied a forum for a voice of reason, for a voice that spoke out for a different view of history.

The ADL once got caught up in a funny deal. My wife was holding a seminar on the Middle East at Mills College. Roy Bullock was there on behalf of the ADL to check on anyone who was speaking against Israel. And if anyone did speak in favor of the Palestinians or against Israel, the name and the license plate number went on his list. The information was passed around so that dossiers compiled on each person were sent to ADL offices across the United States, available only to the ADL.

Spying for South Africa

But if you’ll remember, back in the late 1980s, Israel had an ally, a fellow pariah in the international community named South Africa. And South Africa was not adhering to the United Nations’ resolution on Namibia, which they were supposed to give up. And Israel was similarly defying United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 [of 1967] and 338 [of 1973], which required that, along with an Israeli state, there also be a Palestinian state. But Israel didn’t want to give up the occupied territories. It was in violation of these resolutions. There’s pretty good evidence that Israeli nuclear weapons were tested by the South Africans.

Bullock and the ADL started looking at groups that were against apartheid in South Africa. Now, there were a lot of nice American ladies who thought it was time to end apartheid in South Africa, including many in the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles. Well, Bullock started going to their meetings. And suddenly the ADL was developing intelligence not only about people who were hostile to Israel, but people who were hostile to the Smuts-Botha apartheid government in South Africa. Soon South African intelligence people came out to see

Bullock and Gerard, and over lunch they said: "We'll pay you money if you can get us information about the people in the United States who are against apartheid in South Africa." So Bullock and Gerard collected, I think, \$16,000. They sent twenty-seven reports to the South African intelligence agency about Americans who opposed South Africa's apartheid government. The thinking was, if they're against South Africa, they must be against Israel, and if they're against the Jewish state, they're against Jews. Anyway, that's the new definition of anti-Semitism given by Nathan Perlmutter of the ADL [and by ADL officials Arnold Foster and Benjamin Epstein in their book, *The New Anti-Semitism*].

Well, at about that time, the FBI got word that South Africans were trying to pirate technology from Silicon Valley. After a while the FBI caught Bullock collecting information, put him under surveillance, and then they called him in and interrogated him. And Bullock said, "Yeah, absolutely, I'm helping the ADL. Of course. We've been looking at the anti-apartheid people." And so the FBI went to the San Francisco police, who were — well, they're like cops in a lot of places. They're not bright. They're Irish. Or Italian. So these Irish cops didn't know that the Jews were so powerful in San Francisco, and that they funded nearly every Democratic party candidate from the governorship down to the Congress. And that's how the San Francisco police learned that their officer Gerard was illegally obtaining information from the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Post Office, and from others, and funneling it — not only to the Israeli consulate or to Jewish organizations — but also selling it to South African intelligence.

And what did the Irish cops do next? They got search warrants to go into the ADL offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles. Well, they ran into a funny thing. It turned out that, for some years, the Israelis or the ADL had been funding ten or twelve police officers. They'd given them two weeks in Israel, all expenses paid — take them over there, buy them drinks, and everything else that went with it, a two-week stay! A visit to a foreign country. Why? Because they wanted to ingratiate themselves with police departments to get information from them about people who were hostile to Israel. And in return the Jewish groups would tell the police the identity of anyone who desecrated a synagogue. This connection between the Israeli Mossad and the ADL and the police went up even to the level of the FBI. The head of the FBI would be invited to dinners, where he would urge everyone to cooperate with the ADL, saying "They're really a fine group, against bigotry and anti-Semitism."

So the ADL helped build up an organization that was able to destroy the careers of people, whether they were in politics or even somebody like Audrey Shabbas who was trying to educate schoolteachers, or Norman Davies, the history professor who was denied a prestigious chair, because of their expressed views on Israel and Jewish history. That kind of power does exist in this country. Luckily the pendulum swings back and forth. Now it swings one way to excess, as I believe, in favor of Israel and the Jewish community. But sooner or later it will swing back.

The important thing is never to accept what somebody *says* is history, whether it was ten years ago, or thirty or fifty years ago. Because those who first try to write that history are people who want to give a message that is consistent with their political views. And if you've suffered two thousand years of anti-Semitism, you can justify practically anything to preserve a Jewish state.

Cluster bombs on Lebanon

I'll close with a humorous incident I hope you'll enjoy. I was outraged when the Israelis invaded Lebanon. The 1954 Arms Control Act requires that if a country to which the U.S. gives arms uses those arms to invade a foreign country, we must by law cut off arms assistance to that country. When Turkey invaded Cyprus [in 1974] we cut off aid to Turkey, a NATO ally.

When the Israelis invaded Lebanon [June 1982], they used U.S.-supplied cluster bombs. It's a terrible, devastating weapon. It drops out of a plane to about a thousand feet. Then, a big napalm-type canister blows apart, and maybe two hundred bombs float out and scatter over twenty-five acres. They're timed to go off every five minutes. The first group goes off on contact, the next five minutes later, and so forth. And even after the planes are gone, these things are lying around on the ground. Troops know enough to stay away from, but little kids don't, and they pick them up and get their hands blown off.

After the 1973 war we gave Israel cluster bombs on the basis of an agreement, according to which they could use them only if they were invaded by the armies of more than one country. In other words, Israel could use these weapons only if it was invaded by two countries. Also, they could never use them in cities, or in partisan warfare, against irregular units. That is, they could never use them in civilian areas, and only against regular troops.

Well, a journalist named Nick Thimmesch, who



The King David Hotel in Jerusalem, in the aftermath of the Zionist terror bombing on July 22, 1946. The attack, carried out by the Irgun Zvai Leumi group, destroyed one wing of the sprawling structure, killing 91 persons and wounding 45. The large hotel was targeted because it served as an important military and civil headquarters for the British authorities who governed Palestine from 1918 until 1948. Britain's prime minister Clement Attlee called the attack an "insane act of terrorism" and "one of the most dastardly and cowardly crimes in recorded history." The attack was organized by Menachem Begin, who later became prime minister of Israel, as part of the Zionist campaign to bring Palestine under Jewish rule.

later [1985] died rather mysteriously, reported that Israel was using cluster bombs. He came to my office in Washington and gave me some cluster bomb fragments. And I said publicly that Israel is using cluster bombs. The Israeli government immediately denied it, but in this world somebody always leaks, and the State Department guys knew that Israel was using cluster bombs in violation of the treaty. And even though the Israeli lobby could make things difficult for the State Department guys, it couldn't get them out of their jobs. So State Department people kept telling me, "You're right, McCloskey. Keep saying it." So I made speeches about Israel's illegal use of cluster bombs. Finally the Israelis admitted that they had been lying, and that they had been using cluster bombs in Lebanon in violation of the treaty.

Well, there was enough concern in the Congress that six of us went over to the Middle East in 1982. In Syria we met with President Assad, and in Jordan we

met with King Hussein. And went to Lebanon where we met with Christian Maronites, with Shi'ites, and with the Druze. In Beirut we had to stay at the American embassy residence because they'd blown up the embassy itself. And we met with Yasser Arafat in his bunker in West Beirut. I remember meeting with Bashir Gemayel, the Maronite Christian leader who was elected president of the country and later killed. That was in July, when Israeli planes were bombing West Beirut. I asked him, "How can you run for president when West Beirut and one-sixth of your country is being attacked by the Israelis?" And he replied, "That's not my problem," because for the Maronite Christians, the Muslims and most of the country weren't really their problem. That was a few weeks before the Sabra and Shatilla massacres [Sept. 1982], when the Israelis unleashed the Christian militiamen into those Palestinian refugee camps to kill women and children.

Censorship, Israeli style

After we had met with those various Arab leaders, we went on to Israel and Egypt. In Jerusalem we were put up at the King David Hotel, the same hotel that Israel's prime minister, Menachem Begin, and his group, the Irgun, had blown up [July 22, 1946] when they were fighting the British for control of the country.

From an Israeli television studio I was interviewed by Tom Brokaw in New York for NBC national television. I'll never forget what happened. He asked what we had found, and about our talks with Assad, Hussein and Arafat. You know, you just get five-minute sound bites. I was asked what I thought of Begin. And I said that he's the same guy who, back in 1947, had hanged British soldiers. He was terrorist. Even most Jews thought of him as a terrorist. Some called him a Jewish Hitler, I believe. And I was asked what I thought of Ariel Sharon [who was then Israel's defense minister]. "Well, he's a butcher," I said. "He's a mean guy." I was asked about Yitzhak Shamir. I said something similar about him.

And then Brokaw asked me what I thought about Yasser Arafat. "Well," I said, "I think he's a man of peace." At that point, the Israeli military censor cut off the interview and the link to NBC in the United States. As I was walking out of the studio, I heard the guy who ran the show arguing with the military censor, a major general or brigadier general. The producer was saying, "You can't shut off an American speaking to an American audience!" and the general was saying, "We don't care what he says about *our* leaders. We probably agree with him. But nobody can say on Israeli television that Yasser Arafat is not a terrorist." And that, of course, was the ADL position at the time. You might remember that Paul Findley lost his seat in Congress because he had met with Arafat, and that Andrew Young was dropped as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations because he had met with PLO officials.

So, you've got this incredibly powerful organization. When you think how many people from the ADL have been appointed to the Clinton Administration, it's enough to make you a Republican. And it's true, incidentally, that the Democrats are far more beholden to the Israeli lobby than Republicans. Republicans tend to get their money from big business, and that's sometimes corrupt. But in this state, if you're a Democrat you can't get elected without the support of Jewish money. That power has, I think, reached its zenith.



Menachem Begin (1913-1992) was leader of the underground Zionist terror group Irgun Zvai Leumi from 1943 to 1948, and later headed Israel's government as prime minister, 1977-1983. Under his command, the Irgun carried out the July 1946 terror bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, the July 1947 murder of two abducted British soldiers, and the massacre on April 9, 1948, of some 250 Arabs, including 25 pregnant women and 52 children, in the village of Deir Yassin. As prime minister, Begin ordered the devastating 1982 invasion of Lebanon, which took the lives of some 20,000 people, most of them civilians. With unstinting United States military and economic backing, Begin's government also solidified Israel's brutal and illegal occupation of Palestine's West Bank and Gaza territories.

Dispassion and truth

I hope you'll keep examining history. I would caution you against one thing I've heard a bit of today. A historian should be dispassionate. I use that word deliberately. Do not let the conduct of your enemies cause you to become less than dispassionate in your historical views. I hate to hear the word "propaganda." I've heard it ever since I've been a young man, calling the enemy story "propaganda." It's unseemly, in my judgment, to say that one point of view is propaganda.

The great American Constitution was probably enacted because of an 82-year-old American named Ben Franklin. On the last day of the constitutional convention, after laboring four and a half months in a sealed room in Philadelphia, they came out with a con-



Smedley Butler (1881-1940), one of the most highly decorated U.S. Marines, retired in 1931 as a major general after 33 years of service. He later said that he had served as a "high class muscle man for [American] big business."

stitution. When people say you're too old to be in the Congress, you just remind them of Franklin's speech. He was 82 when he got up and said: "Gentleman, the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, even on matters that I was once certain of, because when I receive fuller information, or new arguments, I found that I was often wrong in the opinions that I originally formed."

A historian, ideally, should be like a juror in California. Every juror, before being sworn in, has to advise the court that he will wait to hear all the evidence on both sides of an issue before reaching a judgment of guilt or innocence, or liability or non-liability. That should also hold true in a special way for the historian, I think. Some of those who viciously oppose you may be tools of the Israeli state, but the historian's words ultimately receive the credit of the community. Think of the first persons who spoke out against the Vietnam war. Most people in my district thought I was a Communist. I got away with it because I had been a Marine in Korea, and they couldn't really say that a Marine was not patriotic. But if some college professors said they were against the war, I remember colleagues in the Congress calling them traitors.

The great source of inquiry ought to be the college campus. The minds of students should be formed by instructors who present both sides of issues. When I was a freshman at Stanford, the rednecks and right-wingers in southern California wanted to get rid of an economics professor there because he was a Communist.

A man who is still revered in the Marine Corps, Smedley Butler [1881-1940], fought for thirty years in every important campaign — Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua. After he retired [in 1931], he was asked about his career. He said:

I spent 33 years and four months in active military service as a member of this country's most agile military force, the Marine Corps. I served in all commissioned ranks from Second Lieutenant to Major General. And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street and for the bankers ... I helped make Mexico, especially Tampico, safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street ... I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras "right" for American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped to see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested.

If you had suggested, at the time, that Marines were dying in Nicaragua or Haiti for the United Fruit Company or other big American corporations, public opinion about U.S. intervention in Latin America might have been the same as it was later about Vietnam.

When people finally learn the truth, they turn against those who have been lying to them. And I think that if the movement of which you people are the cutting edge can retain dispassion in the face of outrages, setbacks and humiliations, the truth can ultimately prevail.

You are doing something worse than criticizing the government of the United States; you're threatening the security of the state of Israel. And the Jewish community is dedicated to preserve that state, and to destroy those who speak against it. Good luck!

Wilhelm Höttl and the Elusive ‘Six Million’

MARK WEBER

SO INGRAINED HAS THE SIX MILLION FIGURE become in the popular consciousness that while the average American may be quite sure that six million Jews were slaughtered by the Germans in the Second World War — that is, in what is now called “the Holocaust” — he has no idea of how many British, Poles, Russians, or even Americans died during that global conflict, or, for that matter, of how many of his fellow countrymen lost their lives in the American Civil War.

This is hardly surprising, considering how relentlessly the Six Million figure is hammered into the public consciousness, not only in newspapers, magazines, motion pictures, and television, but also routinely in our schools, and even by a special taxpayer-funded U.S. federal government agency, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, which runs the imposing U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC.

The familiar *World Book Encyclopedia* tells readers, for example: “By the end of 1945, the Nazis had slaughtered more than 6 million Jewish men, women and children — over two-thirds of the Jews in Europe.”¹ German president Richard von Weizsäcker, in his much cited commemorative speech of May 8, 1985, spoke of “the six million Jews who were murdered in German concentration camps.” Anglo-Jewish historian Martin Gilbert, a prolific writer who is also the “official” biographer of Winston Churchill, has referred to “the systematic murder of six million Jews.”² The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* states flatly: “There can be no doubt as to the estimated figure of some six million victims.”³ An

information sheet issued by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council describes the grand Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC, as a “living memorial to the six million Jews and millions of other victims of Nazi fanaticism who perished in the Holocaust.”

Just what is the basis for this familiar figure?

Even before the end of the Second World War in Europe, that is, before any careful or detailed investigation was possible, the Six Million figure was already in wide circulation. For example, in essays published in late 1944 and early 1945, the prominent Soviet-Jewish writer Ilya Ehrenburg repeatedly told his many readers that “the Germans” had killed six million Jews. In an article published in March 1945, for instance, in the English-language London weekly, *Soviet War News*, he wrote: “The world now knows that Germany has killed six million Jews.”⁴

Some weeks later, as David Irving has related, this figure was affirmed in New York by representatives of major Jewish organizations:⁵

In June 1945, just a few weeks after the end of the war in Europe, three Jewish lawyers who represented major Jewish organizations, met in New York with Robert Jackson, who would soon be serving as the chief U.S. prosecutor at the so-called “International Military Tribunal” in Nuremberg. Jackson asked how many Jews had lost their lives in all Nazi-occupied lands. The number, he was told, was six million.

Mark Weber is director of the Institute for Historical Review. This essay is adapted from his address at David Irving’s “Real History” conference in Cincinnati, August 31, 2001.



Wilhelm Höttl is pictured here some months after the end of the war, when he was working for U.S. intelligence. In a November 1945 affidavit he said that fellow SS officer Adolf Eichmann had told him in August 1944 that German authorities had killed six million Jews. Höttl's historic affidavit was the only specific evidence presented to the Nuremberg Tribunal for the familiar Six Million figure.

By remarkable coincidence, some twenty-five years earlier the American Jewish community had been warning of a "holocaust" of six million Jews in Europe. In an address published in 1919 in a leading Jewish American paper, the *American Hebrew* of New York City, under the headline "The Crucifixion of Jews Must Stop!," the former governor of New York state, Martin Glynn, spoke repeatedly of "six million" European Jews who were "dying" and "being whirled toward the grave" in a "threatened holocaust of human life."⁶

Given all this, it is hardly surprising that someone was found to provide "proof" for the Six Million figure at the most extravagant judicial undertaking in history, the 1945-46 trial in Nuremberg of Hermann Göring, Rudolf Hess, and other high-ranking Third Reich personalities. The legendary figure was fixed in history at the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg, where it was cited by chief British prosecutor Sir Hartley Shawcross in his closing address, and by the Allied judges in their final judgment.⁷

This figure was not the result of any careful investigation, research, or calculation. The only specific evidence presented for it to the Nuremberg Tribunal was the hearsay testimony of former SS officer Wilhelm

Höttl (sometimes spelled Hoettl), who said that he recalled it from a remark by Adolf Eichmann, the wartime head of the Jewish affairs section of Himmler's Reich Security Main Office (RSHA). Höttl, who also served with the RSHA during the war, stated in an affidavit dated November 26, 1945, and provided to the U.S. prosecution at Nuremberg, that Eichmann confided to him in August 1944 that some four million Jews had been killed in the "various extermination camps," and another two million had been killed in other ways, mostly in shootings by *Einsatzgruppen* forces in the course of the military campaign in Russia.⁸

Eichmann himself, it should be noted, later called the Höttl story "nonsense," vigorously denied ever having made the alleged remark, and speculated that Höttl may have picked up the figure from a radio or newspaper report.⁹

If it were not for Wilhelm Höttl's role in branding into the world's consciousness the trademark Six Million figure, his place in history would likely be little more than a footnote.

Who was this man, and how reliable is his historic affidavit?

He was born in Vienna in March 1915. In 1938, at the remarkably young age of twenty-three, he received a doctorate in history from the University of Vienna. While still a student there, he joined the National Socialist party and the SS. From 1939 until the end of the war in Europe, Höttl was employed almost without interruption by Germany's central intelligence agency, the RSHA. He was first stationed in Vienna with the "foreign bureau" (Amt Ausland, later Amt VI), and then, from early 1943, in Berlin in the "Southeastern Europe" branch E of Amt VI, with the SS rank of major (Sturmbannführer).

In March 1944 Höttl was assigned to Budapest, where he served as second in command to Himmler's SS representative in Hungary, and as political advisor to Hitler's ambassador there, Edmund Veesenmayer, who reported to Berlin, for example, on the large-scale deportations in 1944 of Jews from Hungary. On May 8, 1945, as German forces were unconditionally surrendering to the Allies, American troops arrested Höttl in Austria, and for several years after that he worked as an intelligence agent for the United States. He died in 1999, not long after the publication of his self-serving memoirs.

In April 2001 the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency made public thousands of pages of long-suppressed documents from its files of major German wartime figures, including the bulging Höttl file. Along with the

release of these documents, two U.S. government employees wrote and issued a detailed report about Höttl based on those recently declassified CIA files, which sheds revealing light on his wartime and postwar career. This report, entitled "Analysis of the Name File of Wilhelm Hoettl," was written by two "historical researchers" of the U.S. government's "Interagency Working Group" (IWG), Miriam Kleiman and Robert Skwirot.¹⁰

These documents establish that Höttl was a completely unreliable informant who routinely fabricated information to please those who were willing to pay him. In their report, the two U.S. government researchers write:

Hoettl's name file is approximately 600 pages, one of the largest of those released to the public so far. The size of the file owes to Hoettl's postwar career as a peddler of intelligence, good and bad, to anyone who would pay him. Reports link Hoettl to twelve different intelligence services, including the U.S., Yugoslav, Austrian, Israeli, Romanian, Vatican, Swiss, French, West German, Russian, Hungarian and British.

Soon after his arrest by the Americans in May 1945, Höttl began working for the U.S. Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency, and then for the U.S. Army's Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC). As the two U.S. government researchers put it: "Upon his arrest, Hoettl played to the interests of his captors ..." It was during this period, while he was secretly working for American intelligence, that Höttl provided his historic and damning "six million" affidavit for submission by the American prosecution at the Allied-run tribunal at Nuremberg.

Höttl benefited from his readiness to tell those who paid him what they wanted to hear, but this eventually proved his undoing. All the same, it took several years for U.S. intelligence to firmly conclude that it was being had.

In June 1949 one U.S. intelligence official cautioned against using Höttl for any reason, calling him "a man of such low character and poor political record that his use for intelligence activities, regardless of how profitable they may be, is a short-sighted policy by the U.S." In August 1950, CIA messages referred to Höttl as a "notorious fabricator [of] intelligence." A U.S. Army CIC report in early 1952 deemed his information useless, noting that Höttl "is involved in extensive intelligence activities for almost anyone who is willing to purchase his findings." In April 1952 his reports were called



Adolf Eichmann, shown here in SS uniform, dismissed Höttl's November 1945 affidavit as "nonsense," and denied ever having said that six million Jews had been killed.

"worthless and possibly inflated or fabricated."

Interestingly, numerous U.S. intelligence reports identify connections between Höttl and Simon Wiesenthal, the well-known "Nazi hunter." One U.S. Army CIC document described Wiesenthal as the "Chief Austrian Agent of the Israeli Intelligence Bureau." A U.S. Army CIC report in January 1950 noted that for the last three or four months Wiesenthal had "recruited the services of Wilhelm Höttl," and had hired him to gather information for reports by the "Nazi hunter."

In July 1952, when U.S. Army intelligence finally broke completely with Höttl, a letter on U.S. Army stationery warned:

Dr. Höttl has long been known to this headquarters and other allied military organizations in Austria as a fabricator of intelligence information. His reports normally consist of a fine

cobweb of fact, heavily padded with lies, deceit, conjecture and other false types of information. This organization will have absolutely nothing to do with Dr. Höttl or any members of his present entourage. He is persona non grata to the American, French and British elements in Austria.

In their report on his postwar career, U.S. government historical researchers Kleiman and Skwirot conclude:

The voluminous materials in Wilhelm Höttl's personality file ... trace the activities of a notorious intelligence peddler and fabricator, who successfully convinced one intelligence service after another of his value, and then proceeded to lose such support.

Indeed, and as already noted, Höttl "successfully convinced" the American and British prosecutors, and the judges, of the inter-Allied tribunal in Nuremberg, and many others around the world ever since, that German authorities killed six million Jews during the Second World War. And even though U.S. intelligence services and U.S. government researchers have, finally, as it were, discredited him, Höttl's most historically important claim remains widely, and even officially accepted.

The recently released U.S. intelligence documents on Höttl, and the U.S. government report about his postwar career, confirm what some revisionist scholars have contended for years. In his pathbreaking book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, first published in 1976, Dr. Arthur Butz cited sources that were publicly available even in the 1950s to show that, during the war, Höttl had gotten into trouble more than once with SS authorities. His involvement in a shady Polish land deal led in 1942 to an SS investigation of his activities. An internal SS report characterized him as "dishonest, scheming, fawning, ... a real hoaxer," and concluded that he was not fit even for SS membership, let alone a sensitive intelligence service position.¹¹ Höttl was,



Ilya Ehrenburg, an internationally prominent Jewish writer and a leading Soviet wartime propagandist, declared in articles published during the war's final months that the Germans had killed six million Jews.

accordingly, demoted. But his luck improved after his friend and fellow Austrian, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, was appointed in 1943 to head the RSHA. It seems that Kaltenbrunner protected him from a second disciplinary action, this one for misappropriation of security service funds.

Regardless of the unreliability of Höttl's infamous affidavit, the more important question remains: How valid is the six million figure?

The most common technique used by Holocaust historians to calculate figures of between five and six million Jewish extermination victims is to compare prewar and postwar estimated Jewish population figures for various European countries and areas, and then assume that the differences between the figures were all killed. This was the method used, for example, by Jacob Lestchinsky to produce a figure of 5,957,000 Jewish Holocaust deaths, in his important 1946 World Jewish Congress report.¹² It is also the technique used by the late Lucy

Dawidowicz, another prominent Jewish Holocaust historian, who estimated a total of 5.9 million Jewish victims.¹³

However, this method fails to take into account substantial numbers of Jews who emigrated or fled to Allied or neutral countries during the war years. It also ignores the fact that many Jews, particularly in Eastern Europe, did not return to their original homelands at the end of the war, but instead emigrated to Palestine, the United States, and other countries beyond Europe.

It further assumes that all Jewish deaths (or "losses") were due to German or Axis policy. Thus, all Jews in areas under German or Axis control who died during the war years are routinely and misleadingly counted as "victims of the Holocaust," regardless of the cause of death. This includes Jews who died of natural causes, perished in Allied bombings of cities and concentration camps, who died as Allied soldiers, particularly in the Soviet military, or who — like hundreds of thousands of German civilians — succumbed to exhaustion, disease, and exposure in the particularly catastrophic final months of the war. Raul Hilberg, probably the most

prominent Holocaust historian, acknowledges that a distinction should be made between “Jewish losses” and “Holocaust victims.” He notes, for example, that the average age of Jews in Germany at the outbreak of the war was abnormally high anyway.¹⁴

It is unlikely that there were ever six million Jews under German control during the war.

The wartime representative of the World Jewish Congress in Switzerland, Gerhard Riegner, confidentially reported to London and Washington in August 1942 that the total number of Jews in the countries occupied or controlled by Germany was three and a half to four million.¹⁵ This figure presumably referred to Jews in the “Greater” German Reich (including Poland), as well as in France, Holland, Belgium, Slovakia, and the occupied Soviet territories. If one adds the approximately 1.2 million Jews estimated to be living in Hungary and Romania, the total number of Jews that came under direct or indirect German control during the war years could not have been more than 5.2 million.

The unreliable character of the legendary Six Million calculation is also shown in the manipulation of Holocaust statistics in the cases of specific countries. In this regard, it is much more fruitful to examine Jewish losses in western European countries, where much more reliable statistics and other data are available, than to attempt to estimate Jewish losses in such eastern territories as Poland, where reliable data is not available. (In the case of Poland, even the country’s borders changed drastically during and just after the war.) An important feature of these manipulations is that even though figures of alleged Jewish wartime losses in individual countries may be inflated and deflated over the years, there is an obvious effort to juggle figures so that the overall total is kept as high as possible.

The Case of Denmark

Consider, for example, the case of Denmark. In 1946 the “Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry” announced in its widely quoted report that, out of a total of 5.7 million European Jews who perished during the war years, 1,500 were Danish Jews.¹⁶ Raul Hilberg, in his highly regarded, three-volume 1985 study, gave a similar figure of 1,000 Danish Jews “lost” during the war years.¹⁷

In fact, fewer than 500 Jews were ever even deported from Denmark. (Most Danish Jews fled to Sweden in 1943.) All of these deportees from Denmark were sent to the ghetto-camp of Theresienstadt (or Terezin)

where precisely 51 Danish Jews (mostly elderly) died, all of natural causes.¹⁸ Thus, even if these 51 are counted as “Holocaust victims,” Jewish “losses” for Denmark were exaggerated approximately 30 times by the supposedly authoritative “Anglo-American Committee,” and 19 times the true figure by Hilberg.

The Korherr Report

At the beginning of 1943 SS chief Heinrich Himmler ordered his “Inspector for Statistics,” Richard Korherr, to prepare a report on the “Final Solution of the European Jewish Question.” Relying for the most part on information and figures supplied by the Reich Security Main Office, Korherr wrote a sixteen-page statistical survey that he submitted to Himmler on March 23, 1943. A few weeks later he produced a shorter supplemental version with the same title.¹⁹

Even though, as Hilberg has pointed out, much about these reports, including their origin and purpose, “remains obscure,” they are nevertheless the most authoritative wartime statistical records available on the fate of Europe’s Jews.²⁰ These top level, secret German documents contain no mention of an extermination program or mass killings of Jews, a fact that seems hardly possible if such a program had existed. Furthermore, as Jewish historian Gerald Reitlinger noted, they suggest that nothing like six million Jews could have been killed, even assuming the most sinister interpretations of the data.²¹ Korherr, a staunch Catholic, declared after the war that he had not been aware that his reports had any sinister or murderous significance.²²

Jewish Restitution Claims

Another important indication that the Six Million figure is not accurate is the large number of Jewish “Holocaust survivors” who have received restitution payments (*Wiedergutmachung*) from the German government in Bonn and, more recently, in Berlin. Individuals who were “persecuted for political, racial, religious or ideological reasons” by the wartime German regime have been eligible for money from the Bonn and Berlin government under the terms of the Federal Compensation Law (BEG) of 1953 and 1956. This includes Jews who were interned in camps or ghettos, were obliged to wear the star badge, or who lived in hiding.²³

As of January 1984, there were 4.39 million successful individual BEG restitution claims. The great majority of these were from Jews. Raul Hilberg has said that



Norman Finkelstein, author of *The Holocaust Industry*, says that, if recent Israeli government reports are to be believed, there would have been some eight million Jewish "Holocaust survivors" in Europe at the end of the war in May 1945.

"about two thirds" of the allowed claims have been from Jews.²⁴ This is a realistic but possibly conservative estimate. Approximately 40 percent of those receiving payments were living in Israel, 20 percent in West Germany, and 40 percent in the United States and other countries.²⁵

The *Atlanta Journal and Constitution* newspaper reported in 1985 that an estimated 50 percent of Jewish "survivors throughout the world are on West German pensions."²⁶ But this estimate is very probably too high. For example, Jews in Poland, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Romania, and Czechoslovakia were not eligible for restitution, at least not at that time.²⁷ In the United States, only about 66 percent of the Jewish "Holocaust survivors" in the Atlanta (Georgia) area in 1985 had received German restitution money.²⁸

If one conservatively estimates that two thirds of the 4.39 million individual claims for German restitution have come from Jews, that would mean some 2.9 million Jewish claims. And if half of the Jewish "Holocaust survivors" around the world have not received any restitution (which is probably a low figure), and granted that the number of claimants may be somewhat larger than the number of claims, it would appear that some six million European Jews "survived" the Second World War. (Of course, some European Jews who lived through the war years died before the German BEG restitution law was enacted in 1953.) And given that there

were no more than some eight million European Jews under German wartime control,²⁹ the number of Jews who died in Europe during the Second World War must be fewer than three million. As we shall see, the actual figure of Jewish wartime dead is substantially lower.

Finally, estimates of "Holocaust survivors" provided in recent years by authoritative Jewish sources cannot be reconciled with the generally accepted "Holocaust" story or the Six Million figure.

Before going further, it is a remarkable fact that, in recent years, the number of "Holocaust survivors" has actually been *increasing*. This is because — as Norman Finkelstein stresses in his important book, *The Holocaust Industry* — Israel, the World Jewish Congress, and other major Jewish organizations, all of which demand and collect billions in the name of "Holocaust survivors," have an interest in inflating figures both of wartime victims and of postwar survivors.

A report issued in July 1997 — that is, fifty-three years after the end of the war — by a committee organized by the Israeli prime minister's office estimated the number of "Holocaust survivors" (admittedly defined rather broadly) at between 834,000 and 960,000. A similarly authoritative report issued in June 2000, that is, fifty-five years after the end of the war in Europe, estimated the number of Jewish "Holocaust" survivors at between 832,000 and 935,000.³⁰ These figures, Robert Faurisson has written, suggest that there were slightly more than three million Jewish "survivors" in Europe at the end of the 1939-1945 war.³¹

Norman Finkelstein, a professor of political science at Hunter College in New York, and author of *The Holocaust Industry*, has commented that, on the basis of these Israeli or Jewish figures, there would have been eight million Jewish "Holocaust survivors" in Europe at the end of the war in May 1945. Remarking on this, Finkelstein has said:³²

There were fewer than eight million Jews in all of Nazi-occupied Europe. In other words, if these numbers are correct, the Holocaust didn't happen. As my mother used to say, if everyone who claims to be a Holocaust survivor actually is one, who did Hitler kill?

How many Jews did die during the Second World War? A year after the end of the war, an apparently impartial Swiss analysis entitled "How high is the number of Jewish victims?" concluded that no more than 1.5 million European Jews could have perished (of all causes) under German rule during the war. It appeared in June 1946 in the respected daily *Baseler Nachrichten*

of neutral Switzerland.³³ The widely-cited figures of between five and six million Jewish dead, the analysis noted, were not based on official sources, but merely private and semi-official estimates that greatly exaggerated the number of Jews that ever came under German control.

Stephen F. Pinter, a U.S. War Department attorney who was stationed in Germany after the war, published a statement in 1959 in which he condemned what he called “the old propaganda myth that millions of Jews were killed by the National Socialists.” He went on to write:³⁴

From what I was able to determine during six postwar years in Germany and Austria, there were a number of Jews killed, but the figure of a million was certainly never reached. I interviewed thousands of Jews, former inmates of concentration camps in Germany and Austria, and consider myself as well qualified as any man on this subject.

Some revisionist historians have reached similar conclusions. Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson have written that as many as one million European Jews may have died of all causes during the war years (not counting those serving in military forces).³⁵ Walter Sanning, a European-American scholar and university lecturer, concluded in his detailed 1983 study that total Jewish losses during the Second World War were “in the neighborhood” of 1.25 million, many of whom died as Red Army soldiers or in Soviet camps and forced evacuations.³⁶

A common rejoinder to expressions of skepticism about the Six Million is rhetorically to ask: “What difference does it make how many were killed? It would be terrible if just one million, or even one thousand, Jews were murdered.” To many people, efforts to establish the true numbers seem like insensitive and perhaps irrelevant quibbling. But the skeptics are not the ones who incessantly and insistently go on about Six Million murdered Jews. It is not the revisionists who have made a totem of this legendary figure, or who invoke it as quasi-sacrosanct ritual symbol. In any case, striving for historical exactitude, even about the iconic Six Million, is precisely what historians are supposed to do.

Notes

1. *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1984 edition, s.v. “Holocaust,” vol. 9, pp. 263-264.
2. Martin Gilbert, *The Holocaust* (New York: Holt, Rine-

hart and Winston, 1986), p. 811.

3. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971 edition, s.v. “Holocaust.”
4. The Ehrenburg essays, published in *Soviet War News* (London), Dec. 22, 1944, Jan. 4 and March 15, 1945, are reprinted in facsimile in the fifth edition of Joachim Hoffmann’s detailed study, *Stalins Vernichtungskrieg 1941-1945* (Munich: Herbig, 1999), pp. 390-393 (see also p. 183), and in Hoffmann, *Stalin’s War of Extermination 1941-1945* (Capshaw, Alabama: TADP, 2001), pp. 189-190, 402-405.
5. David Irving, *Nuremberg: The Last Battle* (London: Focal Point, 1996), pp. 61-62.
6. *The American Hebrew* (New York), Oct. 31, 1919, p. 582. Facsimile in *The Journal of Historical Review* 15, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1995), p. 31. Also cited in Irving, *Nuremberg*, p. 62.
7. *Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal* (IMT), vol. 1 (Nuremberg: 1947-1949), pp. 252-253; IMT, vol. 19, p. 434; and IMT, vol. 22, p. 496.
8. Höttl affidavit of Nov. 26, 1945: 2738-PS (USA-296) in IMT, vol. 31, pp. 85-87, and *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (NC&A), vol. 5 (Washington, DC: 1946-1948), pp. 380-382; 2615-PS in NC&A, vol. 5, pp. 338-339. On the ad hoc and self-serving origins of the Höttl affidavit, see Otto Skorzeny’s letter of Dec. 14, 1956, in Gerd Honsik, *Freispruch für Hitler?* (Gibraltar and Barcelona: 1994), pp. 196-197.
9. R. Aschenauer, ed., *Ich, Adolf Eichmann* (Leoni [Bavaria]: Druffel, 1980), pp. 460-461, 474; Jochen von Lang, ed., *Eichmann Interrogated* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1983), pp. 117-118. Dieter Wisliceny, another former SS officer, made a statement similar to Höttl’s at Nuremberg on Jan. 3, 1946, but spoke of “only” four or five million Jews killed. IMT, vol. 4, p. 371. Eichmann later called Wisliceny’s comments “theater,” and said that he never had any figures of “exterminated” Jews. See von Lang, ed., *Eichmann*, pp. 164-165, 94-95, 110-117.
10. The report is posted on the U.S. National Archives web site: <http://www.nara.gov/iwg/declass/hoettl.html>
11. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Newport Beach, CA: IHR, 1997), p. 81.
12. Jacob Lestchinsky (Leszczynski), “Balance Sheet of Extermination,” 1946 and revised in 1955. Cited in Nora Levin, *The Holocaust* (New York: Crowell, 1968), p. 718; Leon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate* (New York: Holocaust Library, 1979), p. 335 (*Revue d’histoire...*, Oct. 1956); Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985), p. 1202.
13. Lucy Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader* (New York: Behrman, 1976), p. 381; Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945* (New York: Bantam [pb. ed.], 1976), p. 544.
14. Hilberg, *Destruction*, p. 1206.

15. Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret* (Boston: Little Brown, 1980; New York: Henry Holt, 1998), p. 77.
16. Levin, *Holocaust*, p. 715; Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (London: Sphere Books [pb., 2nd ed.], 1971), p. 546; Wolfgang Scheffler, *Judenverfolgung im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1960), p. 114.
17. Hilberg, *Destruction*, p. 1048.
18. Leni Yahil, *The Rescue of Danish Jewry* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1969), p. 318; Dawidowicz, *The War*, p. 505.
19. Documents NO-5193 through NO-5198. Complete texts in German and English in: Serge Klarsfeld, ed., *The Holocaust and the Neo-Nazi Mythomania* (New York: B. Klarsfeld Foundation, 1978), pp. 165-211 (appendices). Also published in: John Mendelsohn, ed., *The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes* (New York: Garland, 1982), vol. 12, pp. 210 ff. (The two reports are sometimes together referred to as "the Korherr report.") See also Hilberg, *Destruction*, pp. 1204-1206; Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution*, p. 136, 138; von Lang, ed., *Eichmann*, pp. 112-115.
20. Raul Hilberg, "The Statistic," in: François Furet, ed., *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews* (New York: Schocken, 1989), p. 158.
21. Reitlinger, *Final Solution*, pp. 534-535.
22. Gerald Reitlinger, *The SS: Alibi of a Nation, 1922-1945* (New York: Viking/Compass [pb.], 1968), pp. 221-223; Hilberg, *Destruction*, pp. 1205-1206. In a letter to *Der Spiegel* (Nr. 31, July 25, 1977, p. 12), Korherr specifically stated that the term "special treatment" in a report's first draft did not refer to killing.
23. *Focus on* "Restitution in Germany," No. 1, May 1985, p. 3. (Information bulletin of the German Information Center, New York City, an agency of the German Federal government); see also: Hilberg, *Destruction*, pp. 1165, 1166; Mark Weber, "West Germany's Holocaust Payoff," *JHR* 8, no. 2 (summer 1988), pp. 243-250.
24. Hilberg testimony in Zündel case, Toronto District court, Jan. 18, 1985. Transcript page 1229.
25. *Focus on* "Restitution in Germany" (German Information Center), May 1985, p. 3.
26. *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, Sunday, March 31, 1985, p. 15 A.
27. Hilberg, *Destruction*, p. 1170; D. Margolick, "Soviet Emigre Lawyer..." *New York Times*, March 10, 1983, p. B2.
28. *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, March 31, 1985, pp. 15 A, 17A.
29. Jacob Lestchinsky, statistician for the American Jewish Congress, estimated that in 1939 there were 8.25 million Jews in the lands that came under German or Axis control. "Balance Sheet of Extermination," in Levin, *Holocaust*, p. 718. Lucy Dawidowicz estimated that the "pre-Final Solution population" of the lands that came under Axis control was 8.86 million. Dawidowicz, *The War*, p. 544.
30. *Number of Living Holocaust Survivors*, July 27, 1997, report of the "Spanic Committee," organized by the Israeli Prime Minister's Office (with estimates slightly revised in May 1998), and the "Ukeles" report, June 28, 2000, commissioned by the "Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany," a semi-official Jewish agency. Both cited in: "Special Master's Proposed Plan of Allocation and Distribution of Settlement Proceeds," (Sept. 2000, also referred to as the "Gribetz Plan"), Volume I, Annex C, "Demographics," pp. C-2, C-8, C-9. Posted on line at the "Official Information Web Site for the Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation Against Swiss Banks and other Swiss Entities": <http://www.Swissbankclaims.com/media>
31. Robert Faurisson, "Impact and Future of Holocaust Revisionism," *JHR* 19 (Jan.-Feb. 2000), pp. 9, 28 (n. 24).
32. Interview with Norman Finkelstein, by Viktor Frölke, in *Salon.com*, "Shoah business," August 30, 2000. Posted on-line at: <http://www.salon.com/books/int/2000/08/30/finkelstein/index.html> See also: N. Finkelstein, "How the Holocaust Industry Stole the Swiss Monies," June 2001, Postscript to Foreign Translations. Posted on-line: <http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/id112.htm>
33. "Wie hoch ist die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer?," *Baseler Nachrichten* (Abend-Blatt), June 13, 1946, p. 2. (This newspaper, founded in 1845, is no longer published.)
34. Pinter letter in the national Catholic weekly, *Our Sunday Visitor*, June 14, 1959, p. 15.
35. Butz, *Hoax*, p. 239; Robert Faurisson interview with *Storia Illustrata* (Italy), August 1979. Authorized translations in: Serge Thion (with Robert Faurisson), *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?* (Paris: 1980), p. 197, and *JHR* 2 (winter 1981), p. 348.
36. Walter Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* (Newport Beach, CA: IHR, 1983), pp. 198, 196.

Remember the Institute in Your Will

If you believe in the Institute for Historical Review and its fight for freedom and truth in history, please remember the IHR in your will or designate the IHR as a beneficiary of your life insurance policy. It can make all the difference.

If you have already mentioned the Institute in your will or life insurance policy, or if you would like further information, please let us know.

Director, IHR
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659
USA

Convergence or Divergence?: On Recent Evidence for Zyklon Induction Holes at Auschwitz-Birkenau Crematory II

BRIAN RENK

WHAT HAS BEEN DESCRIBED as “the most extensive judicial examination of the Holocaust period since the [1961] Adolf Eichmann trial in Israel,” David Irving’s libel action against Deborah Lipstadt, generated a wealth of fresh research and renewed the debate over gassing at Auschwitz during the Second World War.¹ No aspect of the Auschwitz gassing claim was more contested at that trial than the evidence for and against four holes in the roof of an underground room of crematorium II at Auschwitz-Birkenau. The jousts over this evidence between Irving and the defense expert on Auschwitz architecture, Professor Robert Jan van Pelt, provided some of the trial’s most heated exchanges.

Trivial as the question of openings in a roof might seem, both sides of the debate, revisionists and “exterminationists,” are agreed that such holes would have been necessary for the introduction of the alleged killing agent, the cyanide-based pesticide Zyklon B. The holes are thus central to the accusation that victims were murdered by gas in a cellar of Crematorium (crematory facility or *Krema*) II in 1943 and 1944. Indeed, in the eyes of Professor van Pelt, considered the histor-

ical establishment’s leading expert on the design and function of the Auschwitz crematoria: “Crematorium II is the most lethal building of Auschwitz. In the 2500 square feet of this one room, more people lost their lives than any other place on this planet. 500,000 people were killed. If you would draw a map of human suffering, if you created a geography of atrocity, this would be the absolute center.”²

Revisionist investigators, mindful of Arthur Butz’s opinion that Auschwitz “is the key to the whole story” of the mass gassing allegation, have long focused on that camp.³ In doing so, some revisionists have called attention to the absence of evidence for the necessary holes in the roof of the alleged gas chamber of Auschwitz’s Crematorium II. In the late 1970s, when Auschwitz was administered by Poland’s Communist government, the Swede Ditlieb Felderer took hundreds of photographs of the remains of the Auschwitz crematoria ruins, and noted the seeming absence of holes for introducing Zyklon B, as described in eyewitness testimony. Fred Leuchter and Germar Rudolf conducted more exacting forensic examinations of the ruins in the late 1980s and

Brian Renk was born in Canada in 1964. He studied at Selkirk College and the University of British Columbia (Vancouver) with a special interest in history and philosophy. He is currently a professional consultant in the masonry industry. In 1999, 2000 and 2001 he addressed David Irving’s “Real History” conference in Cincinnati. At the 2001 meeting, he debated fellow researcher and author Charles Provan on the evidence for the alleged mass killings in gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1943 and 1944. Renk’s detailed dissection of the infamous “Franke-Gricksch ‘Resettlement-Action Report’” appeared in the Fall 1991 *Journal*. He and his wife make their home in North Vancouver, British Columbia.



Brian Renk at the 13th IHR Conference in Irvine, California, May 2000.

early 1990s, drawing the same conclusion. The eminent French revisionist Professor Robert Faurisson summed up the problem of the holes in 1993 with a simple slogan, “No holes, no Holocaust.”

During the Irving trial it was not merely the evidence for and against the all-important holes that was in dispute, but also the manner in which that evidence was to be evaluated. In his Judgement of April 11, 2000, the Hon. Mr. Justice Charles Gray questioned whether British historian David Irving had “bent or falsified or misrepresented evidence,” something that the Lipstadt defense eagerly asserted.⁴

On the other hand, during the trial van Pelt invoked an explanatory concept seemingly diametrically opposed to bending the facts: “convergence of evidence.” This is a process of evaluation by which independent strands of evidence, when considered together with other individual pieces of evidence, are said to indicate a common conclusion, even in the absence of a “smoking gun.”⁵

The chief purpose of this article is the careful examination of recent and seemingly authoritative attempts to establish the presence of roof holes in *Leichenkeller* (or morgue) 1 of crematory facility II, by Lipstadt expert witness Robert Jan van Pelt and others. Mindful of the concern for careful interpretation of the evidence in the Irving trial, this article will also examine the differing kinds of evidence offered for the roof openings in the light of both bending and convergence: is there an

actual convergence of evidence for the holes, or has quite divergent evidence been bent and twisted in order to make it *seem* as if it converged?

Missing Holes

In his judgment in favor of Deborah Lipstadt and Penguin Books, the Hon. Mr. Justice Charles Gray summarized the contrasting arguments of the defendants and David Irving on the defense’s evidence for openings in the roof of the alleged gas chamber in Crematorium II:


It is common ground that the roof of *Leichenkeller* I was supported by seven concrete pillars. The Defendants allege that adjacent to four of these pillars there ran hollow ducts or chimneys made of heavy wire mesh which protruded through holes in the roof where the pellets were poured into them and ran down into the chamber below. These ducts were 70 square centimeters [27.3 inches square, i.e. 745.29 sq. inches] in size but tapered at the top where they passed through the roof. It is Irving’s case that these ducts never existed. He made that assertion because, he said, there is no trace in what remains of the roof of any holes through it. Furthermore the chimneys do not appear in the blueprints for the construction of the Crematoria. Part of the roof of *Leichenkeller* I is intact, although it has pancaked down on to the floor. Irving produced a photograph which appears to show no sign of any hole in the roof.⁶

In his next sentence Justice Gray pointed to a major concession by Robert Jan van Pelt, the defense’s expert witness on the Auschwitz crematoria: “Van Pelt conceded in one of his supplementary reports that there is no sign of the holes.” Or, as van Pelt wrote in his expert report for the Lipstadt defense: “Today, these four small holes that connected the wire-mesh columns and the chimneys cannot be observed in the ruined remains of the concrete slab.”⁷

Under cross-examination by David Irving on January 28, 2000, van Pelt admitted that he had “frequently visited the roof of the alleged factory of death,” but had not seen the requisite holes there:

Irving: You have not seen any holes in the roof, have you, in the — when you went there? You have not found any holes?

Van Pelt: I have not seen the holes for the col-



Features of Birkenau camp (Auschwitz II):

1. Rail siding and "selection" ramp 2. Crematory facility (*Krema*) II 3. Crematory facility (*Krema*) III 4. Crematory facility (*Krema*) IV 5. Crematory facility (*Krema*) V 6. "Disinfection and Disinfestation Facility," also known as the "Central Sauna" 7. "Canada" section, where inmates' belongings were sorted and stored. 8. Hospital or sick bay section 9. "Gypsy Camp" section 10. "Men's Camp" section 11. "Hungarian Camp" section 12. "Family camp" section 13. "Women's Camp" section 15. Entry gate for rail transport

umns, no.

Irving: Not for the introduction of the cyanide?


Van Pelt: No.⁸

In his expert report, van Pelt advanced an odd rationale for the absence of these holes:

Yet does this mean they were never there? We know that after the cessation of the gassings in the Fall of 1944 all the gassing equipment was removed, which implies both the wire-mesh

columns and the chimneys. What would have remained would have been the four narrow holes in the slab. While there is not certainty in this particular matter, it would have been logical to attach at the location where the columns had been some formwork at the bottom of the gas chamber ceiling, and pour some concrete in the holes, and thus restore the slab.⁹

During cross-examination, Irving poured scorn on this argument. As the BBC News Online reported, Irv-



The Birkenau camp, from an enlarged portion of an Allied aerial reconnaissance photograph taken on May 31, 1944. Hundreds of thousands of Jews were supposedly killed between early 1943 and late 1944 in semi-underground morgues (*Leichenkeller*) adjacent to crematory buildings (*Kremas*) II and III, visible at the upper left. Source: John Ball, *The Ball Report* (1993), p. 5 (Photo from the US National Archives)

ing told the court: “I do not accept that the Nazis, in the last frantic days of the camp, when they were in a blue funk, would have gone around with buckets of cement filling the holes that they were going to dynamite.”¹⁰


A ‘Restoration’ So Perfect It Left No Traces?

There are sound technical reasons for joining Irving in rejecting van Pelt’s claim that the Germans filled, let alone “restored,” the alleged Zyklon holes in the roof of *Leichenkeller* 1. In the first place, it would simply not have been possible to “restore the slab,” as van Pelt alleged was done.

The concrete roofs of the *Leichenkeller* were reinforced with lengths of rebar (short for reinforcing bar), steel rods placed in concrete when it is poured. If holes

had been designed prior to the original concrete pour, and created by means of formwork placed to exclude inflowing concrete (as Van Pelt believes), then naturally the steel reinforcement rods would have been confined to the surrounding concrete.

To be sure, it would have been possible to “pour some concrete in the holes” at a later time. If at the end of the war wooden formwork was placed beneath the holes and concrete poured into them (van Pelt’s scenario), then square blocks of concrete would have formed within the apertures after drying. These blocks could not have been affixed to the existing rebar grid. Indeed, there are only two ways in which these areas could have been partially reinforced to prevent the concrete blocks from falling out of the holes upon removal of the formwork:



Birkenau crematory structure (*Krema*) II, in a German photograph taken in late January 1943. At the upper left a man can be seen working on the roof. In the right foreground, under a thin coating of snow, one can see the low, rectangular roof of semi-underground morgue (*Leichenkeller*) 1, which juts perpendicularly from the *Krema* building. Beneath that roof, it is widely claimed, half a million Jews were killed with poison gas from early 1943 to late 1944. Yet in this photograph, which was taken well after the concrete roof had been poured, there is no trace of openings — “vents” or “chimneys” claimed by a few survivor “witnesses” — that would have been necessary for the induction of the lethal Zyklon B. Source: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), p. 335. (Photo from the Auschwitz State Museum archives).

- chipping or cutting the sides of the apertures to create ridges, or divets, to secure the blocks in place, or else increasing the size of the holes on top, so that the blocks poured to fit could not fall through the holes in the ceiling below;

- drilling horizontally into the concrete roof on all four sides of each opening, allowing the placement of steel dowels, which would support the concrete blocks once they cured.


Neither of these construction techniques would have secured the concrete in the holes for long, however. In early 1945 Auschwitz personnel inserted powerful charges in the concrete roof support columns immediately adjacent to the alleged positions of the filled-in holes, and then dynamited the *Leichenkeller* roof.¹¹

Van Pelt’s claim that concrete was simply poured into the holes, and then blown out when the building was dynamited, does little to advance the argument that

the holes existed. As Irving observed, it would seem senseless for the Germans to have filled the holes with concrete, and then blown the filler blocks out by placing massive dynamite charges directly beneath them a few weeks later. More important, despite several onsite searches van Pelt has conceded, as we have seen, that today the alleged holes “cannot be observed in the ruined remains of the concrete slab.”

Let us consider what would necessarily be visible had the holes, or their concrete fillers, somehow survived the explosion. Both would be easy to spot today, even in the ruins. The places where concrete had been poured long after the initial pour of the roof slab would be easily distinguishable from the surrounding slab. Variations in concrete mixing compounds (ratios of sand, cement, and water, etc., as well as consistency of source for materials), curing conditions (temperature and humidity), drying lines and hairline cracks due to shrinkage, and aging (yellowing) all contribute to vari-

ZYKLON B INTRODUCTION COLUMN (FIXED SECTION)



1. *Anatomy*, p.167
 2. *Technique*, pp. 322-325
 3. *Technique*, p. 487
 4. *Technique*, p. 340
 5. *Technique*, p. 430
 6. *Technique*, pp. 233, 235
 7. *Technique*, p. 206
- © 1996 MARK VAN ALSTINE

An "exterminationist" diagram of an alleged wire-mesh induction column, with opening at the top, through which Zyklon B was supposedly poured into the "gas chamber" of Birkenau *Krema II*. No documentary or material evidence for the existence of any such opening has ever been found. In this diagram, based on "synthesized" testimonies of a few former prisoners, the opening above the wire-mesh columns is more than 2 x 2 feet (70 x 70 cm) wide. Other defenders of the gas chamber story, citing other prisoner testimony, claim that the opening was only about 10 x 10 inches (25 x 25 cm) wide. Source: Mark Van Alstine, J. McCarthy, "Zyklon Introduction Columns," Holocaust History Project: <http://www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/intro-columns/>

ations in appearance and consistency in finished concrete products. The "restored" areas of the concrete roof slab would be recognizable, from above and below, as concrete repair patches. Van Pelt, who consults with architects in his faculty at the University of Waterloo, should certainly know this. Yet despite numerous inspections of the ruins of the roof slab of Crematorium II by van Pelt and his allies, to date none of these researchers has been able to discover any traces of such

a restoration. This doubtless explains why van Pelt, for all his architectural expertise on Auschwitz, made no attempt at the Irving-Lipstadt trial to present physical evidence for the murderous holes of Crematorium II, whether filled in or not.

The Problem of The Wire Mesh Columns

Unable to find physical evidence of Zyklon-induction holes at the site, or a single reference to them in the camp's voluminous design and construction records, van Pelt was forced to rely on the postwar testimony of two Auschwitz survivors, Henryk Tauber and Michal Kula.

Cross-examined on his impression of the former Sonderkommando worker Henryk Tauber, who gave his testimony before a Soviet-Polish investigative commission on May 24, 1945, Van Pelt answered: "Tauber is an amazingly good witness ... very precise in general."¹²


In his testimony Henryk Tauber described, in meticulous detail, the means by which Zyklon B granules were supposedly introduced into the room. According to Tauber (and thus van Pelt), the holes in the roof opened to accommodate an introduction device constructed of wire mesh:

The roof of the gas chamber was supported by concrete pillars running down the middle of its length. On either side of these pillars there were four others, two on each side. The sides of these pillars, which went up through the roof, were of heavy wire mesh. Inside this grid, there was another of finer mesh and inside that a third of very fine mesh. Inside this last mesh cage there was a removable can that was pulled out with a wire to recover the pellets from which the gas had evaporated.¹³

Van Pelt, in both his expert report and his cross-examination, augmented Tauber's testimony with that of Michal Kula, who claimed to have constructed the wire mesh "pillars" described by Tauber. On June 11, 1945, Kula testified to examining magistrate Jan Sehn (like Tauber's questioners a Communist functionary):

Among other things the metal workshop made the false showers intended for the gas chambers, as well as the wire-mesh columns for the introduction of the contents of the tins with Zyklon into the gas chambers.

These columns were around 3 meters high



This cross section diagram of a Birkenau crematory structure morgue (*Leichenkeller*) was prepared in September 1943 by the "Huta" construction firm. As with other wartime German diagrams and documents, it shows no holes or "chimneys" in the roof, "wire mesh columns," or traces of any "homicidal adaptations." Source: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989), p. 324.

[ca. 9 feet, 10 inches], and they were 70 centimeters square in plan. Such a column consisted of 6 wire screens which were built the one within the other. The inner screen was made from 3 millimeter [ca. one-eighth of an inch] thick wire, fastened to iron corner posts of 50 by 10 millimeters. Such iron corner posts were on each corner of the column and connected on the top in the same manner. The openings of the wire mesh were 45 millimeters square. The second screen was made in the same manner, and constructed within the column at 150 millimeters distance from the first. The openings of the second were around 25 millimeters square. In the corners these screens were connected to each other by iron posts. The third part of this column could be moved. It was an empty column with a square footprint of around 150 millimeters made of sheet zinc. At the top it was closed by a metal sheet, and at the bottom with

a square base. At a distance of 25 millimeters from the sides of these columns were soldered tin corners supported by tin brackets.

On these corners were mounted a thin mesh with openings of about one millimeter square. This mesh ended at the bottom of the column and from here ran in the [Verlaenderung] of the screen a tin frame until the top of the column. The contents of a Zyklon tin were thrown from the top on the distributor, which allowed for an equal distribution of the Zyklon to all four sides of the column. After the evaporation of the gas the whole middle column was taken out."¹⁴

According to van Pelt, the wire mesh devices have vanished: "The wire mesh columns had been totally dismantled after the cessation of gassings and before the demolition of the crematoria, and no remains were found."¹⁵

These two testimonies are not merely van Pelt's chief



In the background of this February 1943 photograph is the south side of Birkenau crematory structure (*Krema*) II. What appear to be several objects can be seen on the roof of the semi-underground morgue (the alleged “gas chamber”). Anti-revisionist writers Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman contend that these are openings for deadly Zyklon. But these “openings” are in the “wrong” places. As non-revisionist researcher Charles Provan acknowledges, “when one lays out the plan of the *Leichenkeller* from the point of view of the photographer who took this picture, and then makes a geometric overlay to determine where the vent objects were located, the following appears: all three vent-like objects, if located close to the central roof beam, are all on the southern half of the roof.” Sources: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989), p. 340; M. Shermer, A. Grobman, *Denying History* (2000), pp. 145-146; C. Provan, *No Holes?, No Holocaust?* (2000), pp. 17-18, 33.

evidence: they are his only evidence of substance for the existence of openings through which Zyklon could have been introduced into the alleged chamber in Crematorium II, ground zero of the Holocaust myth.

The Incredible, Undetectable, Shrinking Zyklon Holes

The two testimonies on which van Pelt is constrained to rely are not without their pitfalls for the champions of the holes. It will be remembered that in his Judgment, Justice Gray took note of van Pelt’s claim, made under cross-examination, that the wire mesh columns described by van Pelt’s witnesses “were 70 square centimeters [etc.] in size but tapered at the top where they passed through the roof.” Van Pelt defended this

position at some length in the following joust with David Irving in London’s High Court on January 25, 2000:

Irving: I only wanted to know roughly what size of wire mesh we are talking about, what the width of this column going up to the ceiling was. We have probably got a pretty clear picture of [the] kind of thing it was, larger than a drain-pipe.

Van Pelt: Yes. Kula says these columns were around 3 metres high and they [were] 70 metres square.

Irving: 70 metres?

Van Pelt: 70 centimetres.

Irving: The wire mesh columns?

Van Pelt: Yes.

Irving: 70 centimetres is of the order of 2 feet 6 inches?

Van Pelt: Yes, a little less, 2 feet three inches.

Irving: So this hole in the roof or these holes in the roof, how many wire mesh columns were there, four?

Van Pelt: Four.

Irving: So the holes in the roof would have been up to 2 foot 6 inches across?

Van Pelt: Absolutely not, because the whole column may be 2 feet 4 inches, but Zyklon B is only introduced right in the centre piece. The centre piece, we have concentric columns, so ultimately the centre piece can be a rather narrow thing, so the hole through the roof could have been a relatively narrow pipe.

Irving: But we are told here he had a concrete cover with two handles covering this whole, which rather suggests something larger than a tennis ball?

Van Pelt: But the concrete cover, we have a picture of these actual chimneys in the documents. Of course you do not when you create this pipe which comes up out the centre of the wire mesh columns, of course you take a larger kind of little chimney around it.

Justice Gray: As a funnel?

Van Pelt: As a funnel, yes. Like a chimney itself always is wider than the actual smoke channel going through it.¹⁶

Here, size very much matters, because the 70 cm square roof holes that Irving is arguing for are in fact on the order of eight times greater in area than the 25 cm or so square apertures for the "centre piece[s]" that van Pelt insists on. For if persistent searches of crematorium roof have yielded nothing like a proper Zyklon introduction aperture, then the smaller the missing holes are supposed to have been, the better.


Yet van Pelt's contention that only the central core of the wire mesh column continued through the roof, and thus "... the hole through the roof could have been a



This detailed enlargement of a wartime Allied aerial reconnaissance photo, taken on August 25, 1944, shows the roof of morgue 1 at Birkenau *Krema II*. "Exterminationists" such as Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman contend that the marks or smudges, visible in a row on the morgue roof, are openings or vents through which Zyklon was poured into the "gas chamber." But as anti-revisionist Auschwitz researcher Charles Provan has written, "no matter what one thinks of the authenticity of the smudgy marks, it is impossible to view them, whether authentic or not, as 'vents.'" All the marks are on the eastern side of the roof, and cannot be reconciled with witness "testimonies." Sources: US National Archives photo; C. Provan, *No Holes?, No Holocaust?* (2000), p. 23.

relatively narrow pipe," misrepresents van Pelt's only evidence, the testimony of Tauber and Kula. As Kula stated to the examining magistrate, Sehn:

These columns were around 3 meters high, and they were 70 centimetres square in plan ... The third part of this column could be moved. It was an empty column with a square footprint of around 150 millimeters made of sheet zinc.



Slanting the evidence: This enlargement of an aerial reconnaissance photograph of Birkenau *Krema* II was taken on August 25, 1944. It appears in the anti-revisionist book, *Denying History* by Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, who caption it with the remark: "On the roof of the gas chamber, note the four staggered shadows, openings through which the Zyklon-B pellets could be poured, as described in eyewitness accounts." Shermer and Grobman have superimposed a rectangular outline over the roof, and have tilted the entire photo, to give the false impression that the "shadows" are perpendicular to the main crematory building. Source: M. Shermer, A. Grobman, *Denying History* (2000), p. 145.

In *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), anti-revisionist French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac furnished a drawing of these wire mesh devices as described by Kula.¹⁷ It depicts each of the wire columns as "around 3 meters high." The drawing shows a type of removable basket in the center of the device. Yet without any basis in Kula's testimony, and in contradiction to the drawing, Van Pelt asserted that the outer sides of these rectangular columns rose only to the ceiling, and invented a "relatively narrow pipe" (contradicting his witness's description of a removable "empty column"), that might have fit in van Pelt's four elusive and arbitrarily diminutive roof openings, if only he could find them — and somehow lay hands on the missing four narrow pipes.

Kula's stated dimensions (a column 3 meters high and 70 centimeters square) cannot be reconciled with van Pelt's claim that the holes, if they existed, were smaller than 70 cm square. Architectural drawings indicate that the distance from the floor to the ceiling (or underside of the roof) was 2.4 meters. The roof itself was 20 cm (.2 meters, or eight inches) thick. Kula's columns would have thus exceeded the distance from the floor to the top of the roof by an additional 40 cm (.4 meters, or 16 inches), and to the underside by an addi-

tional 60 cm (.6 meter, or 2 feet). Nor does Kula's testimony give any support to van Pelt's claim that only a fixed, narrow pipe, or column, continued through the roof.

In his efforts to demonstrate that once there were holes — small holes — in the roof, van Pelt proclaimed that survivor witness Henryk Tauber's testimony "converged" with Kula's descriptions. And indeed, despite various discrepancies, the two witness in fact converged on one vital point.

Tauber stated: "The sides of these pillars, which went up through the roof, were of heavy wire mesh." Tauber's description of the columns offers no support to van Pelt's contention that only "a rather narrow thing" of lesser dimensions continued through the roof. Tauber makes clear that the outermost layer of Kula's 70 cm squared wire pillars "went up through the roof," all the more so since he distinguishes in his testimony between the outer "heavy wire mesh" and inner grids of "finer mesh" and "very fine mesh."

That claim strengthens another argument against the smaller roof holes, based on the size of the columns as described by van Pelt's source, Kula. According to his testimony, he built the elaborately constructed columns, complete with "soldered tin corners," in the

camp metalwork shop — not in the *Leichenkeller*. Even if these 3 m tall, “heavy wire mesh” devices had been somehow maneuvered down the stairs and through the door into the *Leichenkeller*, they could not have been stood vertical from within a room with a 2.4 m high ceiling. Thus, if such columns existed, they can only have been installed by way of holes in the roof wide enough to admit them at the dimensions claimed for their base: 70 cm square.

Van Pelt, in searching for openings rather smaller than 70 centimeters square, has misrepresented the testimony of the two witnesses on whom he has staked his case (in the absence of any forensic or documentary evidence) for the existence of the holes. His radical distortion of the testimony of his key witnesses, conscious or not, would seem to suggest a motive: as we shall see below, if there had been openings of 70 cm (over two feet) square on the roof, they would be easily discernible even today. And, as we have already learned from van Pelt’s admission, the wire-mesh chimneys have disappeared, too.

Recent Investigations: The Holes ‘Rediscovered’?

Wartime Photographs. Van Pelt sought to corroborate his negligible testimonial evidence for the Zyklon holes through wartime photographs that show the roof of *Leichenkeller* 1 of Birkenau’s crematorium II. In his attempts to find images of the holes and their “chimneys” on photos taken on the ground and from the air, van Pelt ran up against the findings, not only of revisionist researchers, but also those of maverick Holocaust researcher Charles Provan. Provan has provided an in-depth analysis of the air and ground photos in his booklet *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller I of Krematorium II at Birkenau*, which contests the revisionist position. While Provan agrees with van Pelt that hundreds of thousands of Jews were gassed in *Leichenkeller* 1 of Crema II by Zyklon dropped through holes in the roof, his interpretation of the evidence for the existence of these holes is often diametrically opposed to van Pelt’s.

Ground Photos. Van Pelt points to a photo from the Auschwitz archives, taken in February 1943.¹⁸ It shows what appear to be objects on the roof. Provan has independently verified through a perspective drawing, however, what revisionist Germar Rudolf earlier established: the three objects are all on the southern half of the roof, contradicting the “eyewitnesses” and (as will be seen) the aerial photos.¹⁹

There exists, however, another ground photo, taken in late January 1943, which shows nothing but an eloquent blanket of snow on the completed roof of the *Leichenkeller*.²⁰ If, as van Pelt maintains, the holes had been included in the original concrete pour of the roof, it would have been senseless and potentially hazardous for the “chimney” surrounds to have been formed and poured appreciably later than the roof was completed. Aside from the inefficiency in construction technique, leaving the holes unprotected for weeks in winter would have caused massive waterproofing problems.²¹

Cross-examined by Irving about this picture, Van Pelt was quite unable to explain the absence of the holes and of their superstructures (or “chimneys”) that he identified in the February 1943 picture (above). At first, on January 26, van Pelt stated that the chimneys could not be seen because they were buried under earth and snow:

OK. Then the explanation is simple. What happens is that after the dirt was brought on top of the roof of the gas chamber or morgue No. 1, the protection [protrusion] would have been less. If we then had snow on top of that, it is very unlikely we would have seen much of these little chimneys.²²

Two days later, evidently recognizing his mistake, van Pelt changed his testimony. Realizing that the photo shows that there were only a few inches of snow on the roof, he stated that the holes would have been covered with boards, implying that the “introduction chimneys” had not yet been built in late January.²³ Van Pelt’s radical modification of his interpretation of this basic document, which must have been known to him, neither inspires confidence in his expertise nor in his claim that holes were made in the roof of *Leichenkeller* 1 of Crematorium II at the time it was constructed.

For Provan, on the other hand, this photo shows:

... the clearest view of the gas chamber in any of the three [Kamann photos], before the roof was covered with earth. The roof is covered with snow, and no vents for Zyklon B are visible. Since the picture is dated from January 20-22 1943, we can deduce that any holes for Zyklon B insertion must have been put in after that date.²⁴

That the Kamann ground photo of late January 1943 offers no evidence whatsoever for van Pelt’s unlikely hypothesis of invisible holes covered with similarly invisible boards, with the concrete chimneys yet



In this photograph of the ruins of the collapsed roof of the semi-underground morgue 1 of Birkenau *Krema II*, a concrete support pillar can be seen jutting through the roof. At the upper right, following a large crack in the roof, is a hole that is sometimes alleged to be an opening through which Zyklon was poured into the "gas chamber." In fact, the pillar was originally connected to the roof beam beneath the area at or near the hole, which was created in the violent blast when the morgue was blown up in 1945. Source: C. Provan, *No Holes?, No Holocaust?* (2000), p. 37.

to be added, is all too obvious. Provan is quite right to argue that the photo militates against the construction of holes and chimneys by the date it was taken, and to recognize that in fact the picture provides no evidence that the holes and chimneys were ever added. On the ground photos of the roof of the alleged gas chamber, then, we have anything but a convergence of interpretation of the evidence from these two researchers.

Air Photos. Van Pelt cited aerial reconnaissance photographs taken by the Allies in 1944, which were first published by the CIA in 1979. The most important of these, taken on August 25, 1944, shows four dark areas on the *Leichenkeller* roof. These areas, van Pelt argued, correspond to the chimneys over the holes, and their shadows.²⁵ Irving responded by pointing out that the four dark areas visible on the photo of August 25, 1944, do not match the positions of any holes in the ruins of the roof today. (As we have seen, van Pelt had conceded that the alleged Zyklon insertion holes cannot be found in those ruins.)

Provan's analysis of the air photos is consistent with that of revisionist researcher John Ball.²⁶ He notes that the necessary holes are said to have been covered "at ground level" (that is, above the layer of earth heaped onto the roof — not at roof level), and surrounded by

low covers, according to Myklos Nyiszli and other self-professed eyewitnesses. Yet, as Provan correctly observes, if these areas (he calls them "smudgey marks") on the air photos "are shadows [cast by the low chimneys], the height has been calculated as about 3 meters, using the known height of the Krematorium chimney, and the length of its shadow as a reference." (three meters is about nine feet, ten inches.) Indeed, Provan "agrees with Ball that some of the marks which show up on the August 25, 1944, reconnaissance photograph are in fact drawn in," and notes that "some of the photographs of Auschwitz-Birkenau show roof marks where no Zyklon B vents are supposed to be."²⁷

Provan fails, however, to alert his readers to the key problem, noted by Jean-Claude Pressac, posed by the marks on this and several other air photos:

According to the American aerial photograph of 24th August 1944, the four introduction points were located along a line running the length of the room in the EASTERN half. In the present ruins, two of these openings are still visible at the southern end but in the WESTERN half.

Nobody up to now seems to have been concerned by this contradiction, nor to have explained it.²⁸

According to van Pelt and Provan, basing themselves on Tauber's testimony, two of the holes should be located on the western half of the roof. As Pressac observes, however, this and the other air photos invariably display the four disputed marks on the *Leichenkeller* roof "along a line running the length of the room in the eastern half." Here one must recall Henryk Tauber's statement: "The roof of the gas chamber was supported by concrete pillars running down the middle of its length. *On either side of these pillars* [emphasis added] there were four others, two on each side."

If Tauber's testimony is correct, then the aerial photos should show two dots on each side of the longitudinal central support beam. But as Pressac has noted, the Tauber statement and the air photos contradict each other: the areas van Pelt identifies as holes on the air photos are staggered slightly, but are all on the east of the central support beam; Tauber testified that two were on the west side of the beam. The two sources of evidence do not converge.

Of the marks on the air photos, Provan writes: "No matter what one thinks of the authenticity of the smudgey marks, it is impossible to view them, whether authentic or not, as 'vents.'" Thus, in Provan's words, air

photos “cannot be used to prove or disprove that the underground rooms were gassing facilities.”²⁹ Van Pelt has been able to point to no evidence that contradicts Provan.

‘Genocide by Telepathy’ Revisited?

Having noted the absence of photographic evidence for the Zyklon roof holes, Provan makes an important concession. Regarding the value of the documentary and photographic evidence in Auschwitz and Allied records for demonstrating the holes, he writes: “[T]he eyewitness testimony concerning the underground gas chamber of Krema II is the main evidential basis for historians of the *Judenausrottung* (extermination of the Jews). The other forms of evidence used to support the eyewitness accounts of holes in the roof of the gas chamber are unable to supply proof that these Zyklon B introduction holes existed.”³⁰

While such findings might daunt a researcher of lesser persistence and imagination, Provan has discovered a rationale for the absence of the holes from the construction documents and photos: the need for secrecy that surrounded the Auschwitz gassing operation. Provan cites Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss, who testified at Nuremberg on April 1, 1946: “I immediately got in touch with the chief of a construction unit and told him that I needed a large crematorium. I told him that we were going to receive a large number of sick people, but I did not give him my real reason.”³¹

Provan suggests that Karl Bischoff, chief of construction projects at Auschwitz-Birkenau, was not told of the building’s “real purpose” until after the building’s completion, if ever. Provan believes this explains why the holes were broken through the roof only after the building was completed, in contradiction to van Pelt’s thesis.

Provan’s suggestion creates many problems in place of the single problem he is trying to solve. During the same interrogation cited by Provan, Höss claimed to have sent the plans for the gas chamber in *Leichenkeller* 1 of Crematorium II to Himmler “after we had completed our plans,” and “after I had changed them in accordance with the real purpose of his instructions,” whereupon “they were approved.” If Höss’s story about the holes, taken in its totality, is true, then new drawings, amended drawings and plans, and on-site specifications for new construction and alterations to planned facilities would have all been necessary. Putting holes in the roof of *Leichenkeller* 1 would have required con-

struction specifications outlined by and for the engineers, construction foremen, fabricators, and installers upon construction. These designations would also have been mentioned in numerous correspondences in the *Zentralbauleitung* (main construction office) files. They are not. Where are the drawings that were changed “in accordance with the real purposes of [Himmler’s] instructions”? And why not, in view of all the above, include the holes in the original construction of the roof? Formwork would have been constructed and placed differently, the placement of the rebar grids would have been modified to allow for holes and to compensate for loss of strength in the surrounding areas of the roof, and the support beam and columns would also require engineering modifications to compensate for loss of strength at the all-important slab-column junctures (with several tons of soil, snow, and rainwater also requiring careful engineering considerations).

Most importantly, the waterproof membrane would have required special attention and modification before holes and their alleged chimney surrounds could have been incorporated into the roof construction. Simply placing the membrane (bituminous felt) under the thin, permeable concrete topcoat and then through (what would later become) the edges of the holes would have been disastrous. And beyond that, the supposed wire mesh devices described by witnesses would have required extensive design and installation requirements.

Provan is mistaken in stating that the drawings to be consulted “would only include details for a crematorium, not a homicidal gassing facility.” How, for example, would secret drawings or plans for “wire mesh pillars” sent only to Himmler have been transmitted to Michal Kula in the metalwork shop months after these items had been deemed necessary? How could Kula have built these elaborate objects without such a drawing? Is this another example of what Robert Faurisson has called “genocide by telepathy”?³²

Here Provan is also at cross purposes with Pressac. The French researcher has labored through the Auschwitz records and at the Auschwitz sites to unearth, in the absence of hard evidence, supposed “criminal traces” of the gas chambers from bits of hardware, carpentry, and construction records. Much of Pressac’s work here has been embraced by van Pelt. As I have written elsewhere, however, the idea of recognizable criminal traces creates a big problem for Provan’s interpretation:

If the crematoria architects did not know what the “real” purpose of the building was, then all of the so-called “criminal traces” of Pressac, such as the alleged removal of the corpse chute [*sic*], the word “Vergasungskeller” appearing in a civilian firm’s worksheet, the design of the ventilation system, and all provisions for gas-tightness, etc., must then also have necessarily been understood by the architects as non-homicidal in purpose. If the holes were deliberately excluded from an alleged criminal conversion as a matter of secrecy, then no aspect of the alleged criminal conversion could have preceded the completion of the building’s construction. Either the building was adapted for criminal use prior to completion or it was not. If it was, there should be evidence of “Zyklon B holes” in the construction photographs [and drawings] of 1943, but there is not.³³

In Provan’s opinion, holes were subsequently “knocked” or “punched” through the solid concrete after the concrete roof was poured. He refers to the testimony of Rudolf Höss regarding the conversion of the *Leichenkeller* of Krematorium I at the Auschwitz main camp as evidence for an alleged homicidal conversion. However, the problem arises that Krematorium I was built and used as a morgue, and is alleged to have only later been converted for homicidal usage in 1941. Krematorium II was also supposedly designed for non-homicidal usage, but, according to van Pelt, was designated for homicidal adaptation in August 1942, more than 5 months prior to the concrete pour of the *Leichenkeller* roof.³⁴

To summarize, it would have made no sense to knock holes through a solidly poured concrete roof, or to build alleged chimney-surrounds for the wire mesh devices after the holes were created. Provan theorizes that the concrete was first poured, then some time later broken away where required, then poured again to create “chimneys.” These “chimneys” would have required special waterproofing at their bases, to keep the rainwater and melting snow of January-February 1943 from seeping through the holes. As has been noted above, all of this could have been accomplished in one operation by setting wooden formwork to create the necessary chimneys and apertures during the construction of the roof.

There is no evidence that any of this was done, just as there are no openings that would have accommodated the wire pillars described by Michal Kula.

In this context, Provan’s invocation of an ill-defined and improbable commitment to secrecy by Höss (is the commandant supposed to have jack-hammered the holes himself by moonlight?) as the warrant for otherwise unaccountably slipshod methods emerges as more rationale than explanation.

Provan’s Eyewitness Problem

In contrast to Van Pelt and other historians of Auschwitz, who have been content to rely on excerpts from a handful of testimonies, Provan has presented sixteen mostly contradictory witness statements on the alleged holes and their attributes. He attempts to reconcile these testimonies with investigations he conducted at the site, although oddly enough in *No Holes* he starts from the testimony, and then proceeds to his on-site investigation.

Provan discounts seven of the testimonies as “of lesser value,” deeming nine of them to be “of greater value.” It must be stated that his analysis of these testimonies is not always clear, and his criteria seem to have left ample room for circularity. While some of his testimonies of “lesser value” can be easily impeached (Janda Weiss’ claim that small children were thrown into the subterranean *Leichenkeller* through a non-existent window), others seem to be excluded for failing to match facts not yet established. Thus, Provan discounts the testimony of Filip Friedman because Friedman places the hollow pillars in the “four corners of the *Leichenkeller*, which is not true.”³⁵

Interestingly, Provan did not include the deposition of Michal Kula, who described 70 cm “wire mesh pillars,” in the testimony he analyses. He thus ignores one of van Pelt’s two star witnesses, although he has included witnesses that describe such oddities as Weiss’s non-existent “windows through which the Nazis could toss children,” the throwing of “gas bombs,” or what Provan calls “things impossible to see [from outside the crematorium].”³⁶ The reason for this omission seems obvious. Kula specifically stated that he constructed the “wire mesh pillars,” but the dimensions he gave (3 meters high x 70 cm squared) are impossible to reconcile with the absence of anything like holes of that size on the *Leichenkeller* roof, as the failed efforts of van Pelt and (as we shall see below) Provan abundantly demonstrate.

Having omitted Kula’s testimony, Provan considers the statement of Karl Schultze, a Topf employee who is said to have installed the ventilation system in *Leichenkeller* 1 on March 11-13, 1943, to be of great impor-

tance. In 1946, Schultze was asked about the “internal arrangement of the gas chamber.” He described it as follows: “The building was eight meters wide and thirty meters long. Inside it was completely empty. The height came to 2.6 meters. In the ceiling were four square openings, 25 x 25 centimeters.”³⁷

It must be noted that Schultze gave accurate outside dimensions for the building, which he could only have been gleaned from the architectural drawings (the inside dimensions were 7 meters wide and 2.4 meters in height), rather than personal observation. Provan seems unconcerned that Schultze’s statement contradicts the claim that wire mesh pillars had been installed (“inside it was completely empty”). Nor does Schultze mention the alleged “concrete chimneys.” These are remarkable omissions of observation, considering the lateness of the known dates on which the ventilation system was installed (mid-late February 1943).

Evidently what matters to Provan is that he has found a witness who gave dimensions for smaller holes (25 x 25 cm), holes that could possibly be shown to have existed in the roof.

The Holes Discovered?

We have established that Robert van Pelt has misread the Tauber and Kula descriptions of “wire mesh pillars,” which actually strongly imply an outside dimension of 70 cm squared, a dimension that would have carried through the roof, as these devices are also described as “approximately 3 meters” high. We have established, on the evidence presented so far, that there are no holes of that dimension in the ruins of *Leichenkeller* I of crematorium II.

Unlike Van Pelt, Provan claims to have found the holes in the rubble. Are there smaller holes in the existing ruins of the roof? Yes. Are they problematic? Yes, but not for revisionists.

It is a physical certainty that *Leichenkeller* I was dynamited in 1945. The violence of that explosion tore a number of apertures and cracks in the roof slab. Since 1945, additional apertures have been created. For example, revisionists have written rather extensively of the two large manually created holes in the southwestern part of the roof, holes located in the wrong areas for them to have been a “Zyklon B introduction ports” to judge from the aerial photos and the “convergence” of van Pelt and Provan in accepting the testimony of Henryk Tauber. The rebar in these areas was either cut back or bent back, demonstrating that these holes are post-war constructs. One of these openings, located next to



A photo taken from underneath the collapsed roof of morgue 1 of Birkenau *Krema* II. No one contends that the hole at the upper left was ever an opening for pouring in Zyklon. Rather, this hole was created in the violent blast of the 1945 explosion that collapsed the roof. This photo shows that holes were created when the roof was blown up in 1945, in an explosion that also destroyed the roof beam below those areas. Note the dislodged rebar rods and the roof displacement near the top of the pillar. Source: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989), p. 353.



Ruins of the collapsed roof of semi-underground morgue (*Leichenkeller*) 1 of Birkenau crematory structure II. Contrary to the claims of "exterminationists," there are no credibly discernible "openings" through which Zyklon B could have been introduced through the roof into the morgue, an alleged mass extermination "gas chamber." Source: J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz* (1989), p. 265.

the first of seven support pillars, is simply an enlargement of a hole that was created when the building was dynamited. The rebar grid and cut rebar tips are visible in the present ruins. There is a crack emanating from the area where the concrete support pillar came to rest, one meter away, continuing through the hole to the other side. This crack would have made it easier for the Soviets or Polish Communists to chisel out the area after the war. Conversely, there is no indication that this hole existed prior to the pouring of the concrete roof. Finally, it is too large to have been a Zyklon B port of less than 1 ft. (i.e., 25 cm) square, and too small to have been 70cm square.³⁸

Running down the middle of the length of *Leichenkeller* 1 was a central support beam, 40cm in width and height. Seven concrete pillars were placed at even intervals beneath the length of this beam, 3.8 meters apart from center to center. This central support beam was extensively damaged by explosive charges placed in those areas in 1945. Provan has identified three areas, in immediate proximity to the central concrete support beam, as possible locations of Zyklon B holes. These areas of broken concrete are located next to the areas

where the first, third, and fifth concrete pillars were located.

Provan writes:

We consider it quite significant that [two holes] were located immediately to the east of the central roof column [beam], each of them right next to a supporting pillar (in these cases, pillars 3 and 5). It should be noted that the central column to the west of both holes is destroyed, with only the rebars remaining. The roof above the reinforcement bars is also destroyed in both locations.³⁹

The case for the number and location of the alleged Zyklon holes of Crematorium II, as well as for their existence, depends on testimony, as Provan acknowledged. At the Irving-Lipstadt trial, van Pelt presented a large number of documents to the court, in an attempt to validate the testimonial evidence. Judge Gray recognized "the force of many of Irving's comments upon some of those categories [of evidence]. He [Irving] is right to point out that the contemporaneous documents, such as drawings, plans, correspondence with contractors and the like, yield little clear evidence of the existence of gas chambers designed to kill humans". Gray also wrote that "the photographic evidence for the existence of chimneys protruding through the roof of morgue 1 at crematorium 2 is, I accept, hard to interpret."

The key witness, for both van Pelt and Provan, is Henryk Tauber. Tauber asserted that there were four holes, two west of the *Leichenkeller* central roof beam, and two east of it. The "smudges" or "dots" on the air photos are staggered, slightly zig-zagged. If Tauber's testimony and the air photo dots are to be accepted together, then the existing holes must traverse the longitudinal central support beam, with two on each side. Provan has identified two successive apertures, both east of the roof beam. As Pressac noted, however, the Tauber statement and the air photo features contradict each other insofar as the air photos show areas identified as holes staggering slightly only on the east side; Tauber claimed that two were on the west side of the beam. These two sources of evidence, as Pressac recognizes, do not "converge." Provan's on-site investigations have done nothing more than highlight this irreconcilable discrepancy. He has selected openings in the roof next to support pillars which are no different than another opening beside a pillar that cannot have been, on the basis of his evidence, the location of a "Zyklon B introduction port." Charles Provan, through his labors

on site at *Leichenkeller* 1, has also shown conclusively that “wire mesh pillars” of the dimensions (70cm square) described by Michal Kula and Henryk Tauber could not have existed, which is also a problem for van Pelt.

It is a pity that Provan seems not to have consulted Pressac’s 1989 book to corroborate the significance of his observations. There Pressac published a photo, which he took from inside the *Leichenkeller*, of the area surrounding the second support pillar.⁴⁰ No witness or researcher has suggested that a Zyklon B port was located here. Nor would it make sense to suggest that. Significantly, Pressac’s photo clearly shows the same characteristics that Provan observes at 1, 3, and 5. The concrete at the juncture of the supporting pillar and the central roof beam has been shattered by explosive charges. The roof has shifted to the east slightly, and a square hole has been created in the roof directly above and to the east of the pillar. Two pieces of rebar connect the hole to the support pillar. It is obvious that the square aperture in this area of the roof was created during the explosion, exactly as at pillars 3 and 5, and as at pillar 1 in the opposite direction (in the latter area, the roof shifted westward during the explosion). The roof lifted and settled, and the 20cm roof slab was broken apart, probably along rebar lines. There is no mystery here: the violent displacement of the roof created apertures.

Conclusion

On the matter of the missing roof holes of *Leichenkeller* 1 of Crematorium II, Justice Gray recognized that “Irving’s argument deserves to be taken seriously,” and that “in the end, the task for an historian is to weigh the evidence of the absence of the signs of holes in the roof of the morgue against the opposing evidence that there were chimneys running through the roof.”⁴¹

This paper is not merely the product of a gracious acceptance of Gray’s historical challenge, for it seeks not only to weigh the evidence for and against the presence of the holes, but also the manner in which advocates of the holes have advanced that evidence. We have demonstrated that at nearly every instance in their evaluation of the admittedly slender evidence for these critical openings, van Pelt, Provan, Pressac, and Shermer have differed among themselves on what they have found. Van Pelt has scoured the ruins of the crematorium roof, and found nothing. Provan has done likewise, and says he’s found the holes. While each claims smaller holes than testified to by the key witness, the

man who swore he manufactured the wire mesh pillars that went through the roof holes, van Pelt accepts his testimony, and then distorts it; Provan disregards it. Van Pelt claims that the holes were made when the roof was poured; Provan claims they were broken through weeks later. Van Pelt sees holes and chimneys in contemporaneous photographs where Provan sees none. Their colleague Pressac notes that aerial photos show the holes on a part of the roof at odds with van Pelt and Pressac’s witness testimony; Pressac, like van Pelt, misses that the marking on the air photo cannot show the chimneys or the holes. Shermer has tilted the photo so the holes will seem to be in line with the testimony favored by van Pelt and Provan.

It is Shermer who has made a mantra out of “convergence of evidence.” He found a willing echo from the Lipstadt expert in the London court. To survey the surreal divergence of these Holocaust savants in their diverse fumbblings for the missing holes, as they warp and twist each bit of fact and fancy to substantiate the holes, is to understand that for them, at least, “convergence of evidence” stands for contrivance of evidence.

If Zyklon holes in the roof of *Leichenkeller* 1 had been there, as described by the most important witnesses within months after the capture of Auschwitz, indisputable evidence of their existence would still be discernible there today. But there is none, and the efforts of the most qualified exterminationist expert and the most diligent exterminationist amateur to account for the absence of that evidence, and of any contemporaneous evidence other than statements from a Soviet show trial and its successors, has produced nothing but a tragicomedy for the Holocaust industry. In fact, there were no Zyklon holes at Crematorium II of Auschwitz-Birkenau, and the absence of those humble openings leaves the Auschwitz myth as blasted as the concrete, and as contorted as this rebar, in the ruins of the morgue there today.

Notes

1. Steve Lipman, “Holocaust Denial Trial: Do We Care?,” *Jewish Week*, February 24, 2000. Deborah Lipstadt is the author of *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (NY: Free Press, 1993). Penguin Books Ltd was the other principal defendant in Irving’s libel suit.
2. Transcript, *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred Leuchter, Jr.*, 1999, a documentary film directed by Errol Morris.
3. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Newport Beach, Cal.: Institute for Historical Review, 1993),

- p. 14.
4. The Hon. Justice Gray's Judgment on Tuesday 11th April 2000 in the High Court of Justice 1996 I. No. 113, Queen's Bench Division (David John Cawdell Irving vs. Penguin Books Limited & Deborah E. Lipstadt), Section 13.127. Available on-line at <http://www.fpp.co.uk/> (internet). Hereinafter: Judgement.
 5. Michael Shermer, "Proving the Holocaust," *Skeptic* 2, no.4, pp. 41-43. Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying the Holocaust: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 31-35, 117-119, 133-137, and 249-251. Expert Opinion of Robert Jan van Pelt, D. Lit., Professor of Architecture at the University of Waterloo Ontario, Canada, on Instructions of Davenport Lyons and Mishcon de Reya, Solicitors, for the Purposes of Assisting the Queen's Bench Division in the High Court in London in the Case between David John Cawdell Irving, Plaintiff, and Penguin Books Limited and Deborah E. Lipstadt, Defendants (copyright 1999 by Robert Jan van Pelt), part four {cf. note 7, 9}, "Chapter VII: Auschwitz and Holocaust Denial," pp. 3-5. Hereinafter: van Pelt expert report. MS-Word document courtesy of David Irving.
 6. Judgement, Section 7.92.
 7. Van Pelt expert report, "Chapter IX, The Leuchter Report," p. 295. It should be noted that van Pelt, in the sentence quoted, properly distinguishes between the alleged wire mesh devices and chimneys; Justice Gray seems to have conflated them in the summary from his Judgement quoted above.
 8. In the High Court of Justice 1996 I. No. 113 Queen's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, London. January 28, 2000. P-129, P-130. Hereinafter: Transcript.
 9. Van Pelt expert report, "Chapter IX, The Leuchter Report," p. 295. Also, see Judgement, 7.118:
The Defendants accept that the physical evidence remaining at the site of Auschwitz provides little evidence to support the claim that gas chambers were operated there for genocidal purposes. The explanation, according to the Defendants, is that, after the revelations in the Allied media concerning the gas chambers at the camp at Majdanek in late 1944, Himmler ordered the dismantling of the extermination installations in the crematoria at Auschwitz.
 10. "Gas Chambers Did Not Exist — Historian," BBC online, January 26, 2000. http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/uk/newsid_619000/619619.stm. The BBC's report is a close paraphrase of Irving's remarks in Transcript, January 25, 2000. P-187.
 11. Charles D. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller 1 of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau* (Monongahela, Penn., 2000), pp. 24-31. Also on-line at: <http://www.revisingrevisionism.com/>
 12. Transcript, January 26, 2000. P-84. "Sonderkommando" (special detail) designated, among other units, the prisoner contingents which worked in the crematoria.
 13. Van Pelt expert report, "Chapter IV, Attestations 1945-46," p. 44.
 14. Ibid, p. 45.
 15. Ibid.
 16. Transcript, January 25, 2000. P-181, P-182.
 17. Pressac, Jean-Claude, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (New York: Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989), p. 487.
 18. Transcript, January 26, 2000. P-6-16.
 19. PMO [Auschwitz State Museum] neg. no. 20995/494, Kamann series. Published in Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique*, p. 340. See also Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, pp.17-18, and Ernst Gauss (Germar Rudolf), ed., *Dissecting the Holocaust* (Capshaw, Ala: Theses and Dissertation Press 2000, p. 346-347. As Rudolf suggests, the three objects on the roof may have been construction materials.
 20. PMO neg. 20995/506 Kamann series. In Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique*, p. 335. See also Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, pp. 18-19. Also on-line at <http://www.airphoto.com/>
 21. "We know that the modifications, at least from the plan we saw there, the modifications of the design were decided — I mean certainly for the hanging of the door in that new staircase was in December the building had been — that the genocidal programme in Auschwitz had been adopted in August, the roof was probably being finished in December, so there was no reason to hack through the roof. They could immediately have made the holes in the roof as they were constructing it." (Irving-Lipstadt Trial transcript, Day 11, PP-127-128.) Van Pelt refers to the Auschwitz Zentralbauleitung drawing 2003 of December 19, 1942, Auschwitz State Museum, box BW (B) 30/2, file BW 30/12, in Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present* (NY: Norton, 1996), plate 17. Van Pelt, Pressac, and Gerald Fleming have argued that the apparent elimination of the corpse chute indicates (only) live bodies walking into the basement rooms, a poor analysis, suggesting the victims of "natural death" could not have been brought into the underground morgues. Interestingly, the only material features noted for the entire basement section (Kellergeschoss) are the subject of the drawing itself, i.e. the basement entrance on the streetside (Verlegung des Kellerzuganges an die Strassenseite), and the elevator (Aufzug). There are many subsequent construction drawings from 1943 showing the inclusion of the corpse chute and other basement details. See *Auschwitz 1270 to the Present: Critical notes* by Carlo Mattogno (note 11) at: <http://www.russgranata.com/irving-eng.html> (internet).
 22. Transcript, January 26, P-17
 23. Transcript, January 28, P-109-113.
 24. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, p. 18.
 25. Transcript, January 26, P-27.

26. John C. Ball, *Air Photo Evidence* (Toronto: Samisdat, 1994). See also <http://www.air-photo.com/>
27. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, pp. 13, 14. Provan attributes the alteration of the photo evidence to a benign didacticism on the part of the CIA authors, one of whom was an expert of faked photography during his career with the agency.
28. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique*, p. 436.
29. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, pp. 13, 30.
30. Ibid., pp. 29-30.
31. Ibid., p. 15. Provan's allegation contradicts Dwork and van Pelt, *Auschwitz*, p. 316: "Himmler ordered the expansion of Auschwitz-Birkenau to 200,000 inmates and instructed Eichmann to fill the camp with Jews capable of work." (Based on a plan of 15 August 1942, Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, box BW (B) 2/1, file BW 2/10). Also, "Bischoff drew up a master plan for the transformation of Auschwitz-Birkenau into a 200,000 inmate labor pool for the armaments industry," *ibid.*, p. 321.
32. Robert Faurisson, "Genocide by Telepathy, Hilberg Explains," JHR 18, no. 1 (Jan.-Feb. 1999).
33. Brian Renk, "Additional Comments on the Provan booklet *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller I of Krematorium II at Birkenau*" at: <http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcgvholes2.html>. For a brilliant analysis of Pressac's "criminal traces," see Robert Faurisson, "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers (part 1)," JHR 11, no. 1 (spring 1991), pp. 46-59.
34. Renk, "Additional Comments,"
35. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, p. 10.
36. Ibid., p. 10
37. Ibid, p. 4. From *Der Spiegel*, no. 40, 1993, p. 162 ("Protokolle des Todes").
38. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust?*, appended photographs. Also at <http://www.revisingrevisionism.com/>
39. Ibid, p. 29.
40. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique*, pp. 353.
41. Judgement, 13.83.

The IHR Needs Your Help

Only with the sustained help of friends can the Institute for Historical Review carry on its vital mission of promoting truth in history. If you agree that the work of our Institute is important, please support it with your generous donation!


Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people.

—John Adams

NEW!

A Jewish Scholar's Explosive Assault on the Holocaust 'Extortion Racket'

Just who benefits from the seemingly perpetual Holocaust campaign? In this passionate but thoroughly researched and closely argued new book, a American Jewish scholar nails the "Holocaust industry" as a "racket" that serves narrow Jewish interests, above all the interests of Israel and powerful Jewish-Zionist organizations.



"Organized American Jewry has exploited the Nazi holocaust to deflect criticism of Israel's and its own morally indefensible policies," charges author Norman Finkelstein. The Holocaust campaign serves "to deligitimize all criticism of Jews."

This powerful book takes aim at the sanctimonious Elie Wiesel and other Holocaust "secular saints," and debunks such Holocaust hoaxers as Jerzy Kosinski and Binjamin Wilkomirski. "Given the nonsense churned out daily by the Holocaust industry, the wonder is that there are so few skeptics," writes Finkelstein.

He exposes the "double shakedown" – the extortion by powerful Jewish groups of billions from European countries, and the betrayal by these groups of actual wartime Jewish victims. "In recent years," says Finkelstein, "the Holocaust industry has become an outright extortion racket ... The Holocaust may yet turn out to be the 'greatest robbery in the history of mankind'."

An important book that has already unleashed a heated but serious debate in Europe!

The Holocaust Industry

by Norman G. Finkelstein

Paperback. Dust jacket. 150 pages.

Source references. (#0521) \$13, plus shipping.



INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
PO BOX 2739 • NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92659 • USA
FAX (949) 631-0981 • [HTTP://WWW.IHR.ORG](http://www.ihr.org)

An Imaginary Holocaust May Lead to a Real Holocaust

ROBERT FAURISSON

WITHOUT THE LIE OF THE ALLEGED HOLOCAUST and the alleged gas chambers, the State of Israel would not exist, and the world would be a more peaceful place. The false Holocaust has become the sword and the shield of Israel, endangering peace. An imaginary holocaust, invented and nurtured by the Zionists of Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora, may lead to an actual, global holocaust.

The Jews and the Americans

In 1947-1948, representing themselves as the survivors of an alleged genocide, the Jews obtained, by blackmail and terrorism, the right to create a state in the land of Palestine. Nonchalantly, they persuaded the international community that, in compensation for an unprecedented tragedy (their supposed "Holocaust"), they merited an unprecedented remedy: the award of lands belonging to other peoples. After receiving this exorbitant gift, they enlarged their territory considerably in chronic wars, paying no heed to the restrictions instituted by the United Nations to protect the Palestinians, restrictions which the Zionists had made a commitment to respect. For over fifty years, with the help of

the Jewish Diaspora, they have carried out a colonial policy of conquest and apartheid against the Palestinian people. The Zionists have violated one international agreement after another, treating some sixty UN resolutions against their practices as null and void. America's political leaders have supported, armed, and defended Israel as devotedly as if it were the foremost state of the United States of America. It must be said that they cannot afford to defy the Jewish lobby, which closely monitors all their country's political and media spheres. Nonetheless, most Americans, intoxicated by the holocaust propaganda, are all too ready to derive their own belief in a world divided into two groups — one good (Jews and their associates), the other evil (Nazis and their ilk) — from the inventions of a Jewish neurosis. For these Americans, the Nazi, supreme villain, ever bent on killing the poor Jew, paragon of innocence and virtue, is the measure of all things. It is not mere coincidence that the ghastly hulk which houses the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum stands in the immediate proximity of the Washington Monument, not far from Capitol Hill.

Robert Faurisson is Europe's foremost Holocaust revisionist scholar. Born in 1929, educated at the Sorbonne, Professor Faurisson taught at the University of Lyon from 1974 until 1990. Specializing in close textual analysis, Faurisson won widespread acclaim for his studies of poems by Rimbaud and Lautréamont. After years of private research and study, Faurisson revealed his skepticism of the "Holocaust" gas chambers in articles published in 1978 and 1979 in the French daily *Le Monde*. He has written numerous articles on all aspects of the "Holocaust," many of which have appeared in this journal. A four-volume collection of many of his revisionist writings, *Écrits Révisionnistes* (1974-1998), was published in 1999.



Robert Faurisson addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 29, 2001.

The Arabs and the Muslims

The Jews have finally exhausted the patience of the Arab and Muslim world. During their long history they had, down the centuries, worn out their welcome with every European nation which had admitted them in large numbers, in particular the English, the French, the Spanish, and, especially, the Germans and the Poles. Until rather recently the example of the long-standing (relative) tolerance of the Arabs toward the Jews served as fodder for morality lessons regularly addressed to European nations. Today, such lessons are no longer possible. The Arab exception is no more: even their fellow Semites are now rising against the Jewish people, “domineering and self-assured” (as Charles de Gaulle called them in 1967). To be sure, within the Jewish community there have occasionally been efforts on the part of a few clear-sighted spirits such as Noam Chomsky and the late Israel Shahak, author of *Jewish History*, *Jewish Religion*, to warn the zealots, but these have gone unheard. That said, Chomsky, like Shahak, has always endorsed the great Jewish myth, thus authorizing Israel to continue to employ, with an untroubled conscience, its best argument and the number one weapon in its arsenal: the “Holocaust,” of course. The Arabs, the Muslims, and the entire Palestinian people are today the principal victims of this weapon and this argument fashioned from a lie.

The New Crusade


On September 11, 2001, the weak struck at the citadel of the mighty, in New York. The heart of Jewish-American power, the financial district centered on Wall Street, where the fortunes of the world’s lowly billions are daily decided, was hit by the full force of “terrorists” brave enough to sacrifice their lives in a suicide mission.

On that day in New York, the first tower of the World Trade Center (a name that meant business!) might have been called “Hamburg” or “Hiroshima,” the second “Dresden” or “Nagasaki.” Yet, their destruction seems to have left, by various estimates, no more than between three and five thousand dead — a far cry from the great feats of annihilation of the U.S. and British air forces in the early 1940s.

In response America has embarked on another crusade. In the 1940s, General Dwight Eisenhower (who would later be rewarded with the presidency) launched a “Crusade in Europe,” a military-industrial undertaking which was to prove most fruitful for the United States (“The Best War Ever”) but quite the opposite for the peoples of Europe: for them it meant millions of dead, immense destruction, and the consignment of a good part of their continent to the Soviet Russian Moloch. This “liberation” of Europe, moreover, brought in its wake a cruel political purge, the murderous expulsion of twelve to fifteen million Germans, arbitrary dragnets and roundups, the dismemberment of a great country, its complete military occupation, a regime of censorship, and the imposition of tribunals in which the victors, as judges and prosecutors both, tried the vanquished in patently sham proceedings. Today, in 2001, trials of the same kind allow the children of Israel to exact vengeance on octogenarians or nonagenarians accused, on the strength of Jewish testimony alone, of “crimes against humanity.”

The Previous Crusades

In reaction to the attacks of September 11, America, this time, is out for “infinite justice,” by slaughtering civilians for the twentieth time in sixty years. From 1941 to 2001, no military corps has killed or burnt more civilians, more children, and more infants than the air armada consisting of the U.S. Air Force and the squadrons of the U.S. Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, sometimes seconded by their ally, the RAF. The knights-errant of phosphorus, napalm, Agent Orange, fragmentation bombs, nuclear fire, and uranium (enriched or depleted) are about to inflict their time-



On makeshift pyres of steel girders, heaped bodies of victims of the Dresden air raid were cremated in large bonfires. Some two thousand British and American bombers took part in the devastating attack, February 13-14, 1945. So intense was the heat of the firestorm created in the raid that molten asphalt flowed through the streets. Conservative estimates put the number of victims at 135,000 — the great majority of them civilians. According to some estimates as many as 300,000 perished in the raid. At the time of the attack Dresden was packed with hundreds of thousands of women and children fleeing advancing Soviet forces. One of Europe's great cultural and architectural treasures, the German city had no importance as a military target. Terrorism and mass killing were the sole objectives of the Dresden attack, which British diplomat and author Harold Nicolson called "the single greatest holocaust by war."

honored lessons in international law, justice, virtue, and "enduring freedom" on desperately poor lands, as they have done to Berlin, Hamburg, Dresden, and to Europe at large (67,000 killed in the "liberation" of France alone), as well as to Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Grenada, Panama, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere. In just sixty years the Americans, who are also the world's biggest industrial polluters, have battered the Earth's surface with billions of bombs, shells, missiles, and mines, especially anti-personnel mines, so dangerous to civilians. Concerned about the lives of their own soldiers — which is understandable — the U.S. armed forces usually opt for a particularly cowardly method of combat. Dropping bombs at high altitude, launching missiles from a great distance, spreading terror among unarmed civilian popu-

lations, the American military has for some years sought a zero-death war, which, as French revisionist Vincent Reynouard puts it, amounts to waging wars in which, on one side, the death toll is zero, or close to it, while the dead of the other side count for ... nothing. Comfortably ensconced on their aircraft carriers or on bases well behind the front, the boys, inhaling their snacks and downing their beer, rain down death and destruction from afar.

The Real Holocaust of the German Cities

Beside the martyrdom of the German cities in the last war, the fate of those who fled Manhattan after the destruction of the two towers was enviable. They escaped the scene of the disaster without being strafed

with machine gun bullets. Unlike so many Germans from 1942 to 1945 — starved, sleepless, grief-stricken day by day by news of the deaths of their brothers and husbands, above all on the Russian front — the refugees from Manhattan were not turned into human torches targeted by fighter-bombers. The victims of the carpet bombings often fled with their hair and their clothing in flames. They would dive into water to extinguish the flames, which would die down, only to flare up anew when the poor souls came up for air: phosphorus. The last to die in the firestorm perished from heat so intense it blistered the roofs of their mouths. As for the firemen and first-aid workers, many of them were killed by delayed-action bombs.

The Futile Lessons of the Past

In this Black September, Americans were able to get an idea — though only a small one — of what they have inflicted on so many countries over so many years. In Vietnam they suffered a humiliating defeat, and brought home 56,000 bodybags. They seemed to have learned what it might cost to scorn those smaller, weaker, and poorer than themselves. France and Britain had experienced identical humiliations during the collapse of their colonial empires; they also appeared to have learned some useful lessons. Now, however, the United States, Britain, and France, all seized by martial frenzy, are forgetting the lessons from their recent histories.

Terrorism Magnified by Those Who Complain of It

It is a bit ludicrous to see the mighty denounce the terrorism of their adversaries. Not only did these same mighty invent terrorism on the grand scale, they promoted it, praised it, and sublimated it, under the term “resistance.” Roosevelt, Churchill, de Gaulle, Tito, and their friend Stalin all, in varying degrees, made the ambush murder of enemy soldiers and civilians their policy. In this way these leaders cold-bloodedly provoked reprisals by the enemy, carried out in conformance with international conventions, so that slaughter would breed slaughter. Thereby the Allies made covert warfare, the coward’s war, a fixture of the twentieth century. Assuredly the spirit of resistance is a noble one, but not in that form. And what is to be said of the terrorism practised by the founders of the Zionist state, who murdered, for example, Lord Moyne, Count Bernadotte, and so many others? A model, it would seem, for struggle in a just cause.



Madeleine Albright directed American foreign policy as President Clinton’s Secretary of State, 1996-2001. A few months before being named to that post, she was questioned about the deaths of hundreds of thousands of children in Iraq due to the scarcity of food and medicine as a result of sanctions against the country imposed by the United States since 1990. In a “60 Minutes” interview, broadcast May 12, 1996, veteran CBS reporter Lesley Stahl asked: “We have heard that half a million children have died [as a result of the sanctions]. I mean, that is more children than died in Hiroshima. And — and you know, is the price worth it?” Albright replied: “I think this is a very hard choice, but the price — we think the price is worth it.”

The Luck of the Jews

The twin office towers in New York were under long-term lease to one Larry Silverstein, who will doubtless get fat “reparations.” His coreligionist Madeleine Albright, daughter of a thief named Körbel, stated in 1996 that even if American policy toward Iraq had caused the deaths of half a million Iraqi children, “the price ... was worth it.” The Israeli Netanyahu could not hide his joy on learning of the destruction of the

towers and the deaths of thousands of Americans: it was good news for the Jews, because America would now understand that its own interests and those of Israel were identical. Sharon, the butcher and incendiary, along with Shimon Peres, saw in it an opportunity both for his policy of planting Jewish settlements amidst the Arab masses and for his program of systematic assassination. For the nonce, the United States lets him kill Palestinian adults and children at will, with bullets, shells, missiles, tanks, helicopters, and planes paid for by the American taxpayer.

Hard Luck Ahead for the Jews

The Americans and Israelis can have their sport. It may cost them dearly, however, for the State of Israel is doomed. It won't last even as long as the ephemeral Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. A bin Laden or a second Saladin won't be needed. Not weapons, not money, not the United States, nor the Jews of the Diaspora, nor Germany which, prey to its national masochism, would be capable of sacrificing its soldiers for the survival of the leech state, will stop "the Descent" (as the Hebrews call Jewish emigration from Israel, as opposed to "their Ascent" to the Promised Land). For the Israelis are already jumping ship. In Tel Aviv, in Jerusalem, in the settlements, Jewish fathers and mothers fear for their own lives and for those of their children, for their careers, for their businesses. The tax burden imposed by Israel's military budget, and the length and the dangers of military service (for both men and women), are decreasing the numbers of taxpayers and potential recruits, by way of the phenomenon of "re-emigration." The Promised Land is becoming the most hazardous spot on earth for Jews. It had been a safe haven for swindlers and thieves, in particular for that mafia called "Russian," which is in fact Judeo-Russian. Israel has granted extradition requests from countries attempting to prosecute Flatto Sharon and similar crooks only very rarely. Today, however, French courts are finding, in cases connected with the gigantic bank swindle known as the "affaire du Sentier," that brazen crooks who had fled France for refuge in Israel prefer to return, even if it means going to prison. The land of milk and honey is awash in blood and tears. Whose fault is that?

Between the Suitcase and the Coffin

So the wandering Jew is about to hit the road again. In nearly every place he has sojourned, his conduct has aroused the revolt of the host population, which has

finally ordered him to choose between the suitcase and the coffin. In today's Israel, he will soon have need to pack his suitcase. He will make his way back to the rich lands that have been brainwashed by his holocaustic propaganda. Bewailing a second "Holocaust" and a third Destruction of the Temple will suffice: then he'll demand new reparations, new privileges. The Shoah business and Holocaust industry will renew their vigor, this time, however, at risk of reaching the saturation point.

In a worst-case scenario, Israel may experience a civil war waged by an underground army of desperados. In the end, Tel Aviv could suffer the fate of Algiers in 1962, and Jewish Jerusalem go down like Saigon in 1975. A less dramatic fall, similar to that of communist East Germany or of the Soviet empire, is also possible. In any case, the epicenter of the present conflict is Israel, and Israel is finished.

War Propaganda

The lot of Palestinians of all faiths will be tragic, provoking ever more despair and fanaticism. The masses of the Arab-Muslim countries already hope to see the West punished for the crimes which, in their view, it has committed or tolerated, in Palestine (more so than for its misdeeds in Saudi Arabia, Iraq, or Afghanistan). A spirit of jihad, or holy war, is growing among these masses, as well. Aya-Torahs and ayatollahs incite one another. On both sides, in the rich and powerful West and among the deprived populations of the Arab-Muslim world, passions and fears are intensifying. There is going to be a great deal of killing and a great deal of lying. The prodigious lie of the alleged "Holocaust" of the Jews, sword and shield of Israel and the Diaspora, could thus lead to a real holocaust of global dimensions. Revisionist authors have long warned that the religion of the false "Holocaust," with its imaginary "gas chambers" and its alleged "Six Million," carried within it a frightful catalyst for hatred. Contemporary events give cause for fear that this hatred will culminate in setting the planet ablaze and provoking a worldwide holocaust.

Revisionist Carefulness

The revisionists will follow the example set by Paul Rassinier, the first revisionist. Proof against all war propaganda, they will aim for exactitude even as emotions on both sides are breeding lies. They will refuse to spread the inventions of anti-American, anti-Jewish, or

anti-Arab propaganda. As for September 11, they are duty-bound to spare us such typical conspiratorial scuttlebutt as “Bush knew,” “The CIA must have known,” “The FBI was in on it,” “It was all a Mossad plot,” “Four thousand Jews didn’t show up for work that day,” “Explosives had been planted in both buildings,” etc. Arab propaganda will harp more than ever on the myths of Jewish ritual murder or Jews poisoning gentiles’ wells, and it will invoke that patent forgery, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Many more rumors, delusions, lunacies, and examples of mass delusion are to be anticipated. The Americans will underestimate the numbers of victims of their bombings and the Afghans will exaggerate them. God or Jehovah, on one side, and Allah on the other, will, together with their prophets, be called upon to incite hatred and fear. False witnesses, false reports, false interviews, and fake documents will proliferate. In this field Bush the son will perhaps surpass Bush the father’s story of the incubators unplugged by the Iraqis in Kuwait. Censorship, of course, will increase without governments even having to pass new laws.

The Holy Alliance of the Mighty

In France, the daily *Le Monde*, which I call the “oblique journal,” made its obeisance at the outset. Under the by-line of its editor, the hunched, sweaty-palmed Jean-Marie Colombani, its lead was headlined “We Are All Americans.” With that, France found itself in a state of war. It is a tradition dear to the left (which, as everyone knows, has a monopoly on warm-heartedness and intelligence) to plunge the country into war without prior consultation of Parliament, nor any decision on the latter’s part. This amounts to a total disregard for the law, for the constitution, but no matter! It allows the French citizen to go to sleep at peace and to wake up to war. To be fair, let us remember that the president, Jacques Chirac, a former Communist turned Gaullist, feels even more bellicose and American than his prime minister, Lionel Jospin, the head of a Socialist-Communist-Green coalition. A kind of holy alliance has been forged against the turbaned pariah from whence all the evil: Osama bin Laden, to call him by name. Once upon a time, his name was Adolf Hitler. Did he not commit an unforgivable crime by meddling with gold, the Jews, and Communism? He had had the effrontery to reject the gold standard. He did so well without it that his new economic system enabled him to trade on a large scale with other gold-poor countries, notably Italy, Japan, and certain central European and



David Ben-Gurion, in the foreground, at the ceremony in Tel Aviv on May 14, 1948, at which he and other Zionist leaders proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel. Ben-Gurion (1886-1973) served as Israel’s first prime minister, 1948-1953, and again from 1955 to 1963. During a conversation in 1956 with Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, he said:

“Why should the Arabs make peace? If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural; we have taken their country. Sure, God promised it to us, but what does that matter to them? Our God is not theirs. We come from Israel, it’s true, but two thousand years ago, and what is that to them? There has been anti-Semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They only see one thing: we have come here and stolen their country. Why should they accept that?”

Source: Nahum Goldmann, *The Jewish Paradox* (New York: 1978), p. 99.

Latin American states. Britain, France, and the United States were panic-stricken: Germany was encroaching on their turf, taking away their markets. The rich (in gold) never appreciate the revolt, the coalition, and the success of the poor (in gold). At the end of the 1930s, the three wealthy nations, which claimed to share the same democratic system, were, more than anything, bound, one to the other, by a chain of gold. After the war, in 1947, L. Genet and Victor-L. Tapié were able to publish, in their *Précis d'histoire contemporaine, 1919-1939* (Paris: Hatier), a quotation which would read in English: "It is thus not an ideological link but a chain of gold that bound the great democracies to one another" (p. 206); they added: "Six years of self-sufficiency made Germany the world's greatest industrial country" (p. 209). The Jewish financiers took even more umbrage than the rest: How could anyone get along without them and their gold?! As for Communist Russia, it watched Hitler put into actual practice the social program of which the Soviets dreamed. The rash dictator was to pay a high price for his temerity — all the higher since he began to push his luck with the recklessness of a gambler on a roll. Then came the catastrophe, for Europe and for Asia, of the Second World War.

Today's new holy alliance of the Western democracies and Russia against the new spoilsport augurs ill for tomorrow. Beneath the usual veneer of generosity and unselfishness, the United States will deal ruthlessly with the Arab-Muslim masses, who might threaten Uncle Sam's supplies of natural resources, his "World Trade," and his economy. Invoking their cherished "Holocaust" and the need to avoid a second "Holocaust," the Jews will be just as ruthless to the Palestinians. The Russians will crush any notions of independence among their Muslim minorities — and Russia already has its hand out for American alms in recompense.

The Only Chance for Peace

The only chance for peace lies in the spirit of resistance to the propagandists' lies. Today the most dangerous propaganda does not come from the poor. It comes from the rich and powerful, and their hirelings, all of whom are capable, if they feel truly threatened, of setting the whole world afire. The most dangerous propaganda comes from the neurotics with their false "Holocaust": the Jews, the Americans, and their minions.

Had the revisionists been heeded, the religion of the false "Holocaust" of the Jews would no longer prosper, nor still be feeding the sympathy of a large part of the Western world for the Zionist enterprise. The Diaspora

would display less arrogance. To begin with, the State of Israel would not exist.

Historical lies breed hatred, a crusading zeal, and war. A return to historical exactitude would promote reflection and peace.

— October 8, 2001

Where are the Missing 'Six Million'? If Hitler Didn't Kill Europe's Jews, What Happened to Them?

In this masterly, unprecedented and, so far, unique demographic study, a qualified specialist shows what happened to Europe's Jews under Hitler and during the Second World War. *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* provides the best accounting available of the actual fate of the "Six Million."

Carefully analyzes the (often fragmentary) census data and the extraordinary population displacements that occurred before, during and after the war, which involved great migrations and deportations of Jewish refugees into Soviet Russia and Ukraine, North and South America, and Palestine.

This study establishes that there never were "six million" Jews under German control at any time. It shows, for example, that the great majority of Jews in the Soviet territories occupied by the Germans, 1941-1944, and who are widely assumed to have perished as "victims of the Holocaust," were actually evacuated or fled — and never came under German rule.

Based on a wide range of sources, including publications of the Institute for Jewish Affairs and such reference works as the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* and the *American Jewish Year Book*, as well as contemporary European periodicals and wartime German documents.

In his foreword, Northwestern University Prof. Arthur R. Butz calls this "the first full length serious study of World War II-related Jewish population changes . . . This book presents the fundamentally correct account of the subject. The perfect antidote to the vulgar idiocies that are today monotonously peddled by the media . . ."

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry by Walter N. Sanning

Foreword by Dr. Arthur R. Butz

Quality softcover. 239 pages. Graphs. Charts. Maps.

Bibliography. Index. (#0389)

\$6.25, plus \$2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Revising the Twentieth Century's 'Perfect Storm': Russian and German Historians Debate Barbarossa and Its Aftermath

REVIEWED BY DANIEL MICHAELS

Grand Delusion: Stalin and the German Invasion of Russia by Gabriel Gorodetsky. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999. 408 pages.

Samoubiystvo (Suicide) by Viktor Suvorov. Moscow: AST, 2000. 380 pages. Illustrations.

Upushchenny shans Stalina (Stalin's Lost Opportunity) by Mikhail Meltiukhov. Moscow: Veche, 2000. 605 pages. Illustrations, maps.

Stalin's War of Extermination, 1941-45: Planning Realization, and Documentation by Joachim Hoffmann. Capshaw, Ala.: Theses and Dissertations Press, 2001. 415 pages. Illustrations.

Revising the history of the Second World War's crucial Russo-German campaign is very much a work in progress, nowhere more so than in Russia and Germany. Ever since Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun) broke the ice a decade ago with his sensational *Ledokol* (published in English as *Icebreaker* [reviewed in the *Journal of Historical Review* 16, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1997)]), Russian historians have been reexamining the many myths, legends, and fantasies associated with the outbreak of the death duel between Communism and National Socialism. The role of Joseph Stalin, in particular, has aroused the most heated controversy.

In Russia, the debate has involved two major groups. The first asserts that the Soviet Union had no aggressive designs against Germany or Europe and was unprepared for war, while the second maintains that Stalin and the Red Army indeed had plans for a surprise attack against Germany and Europe, but were beaten to the punch by Hitler.

Daniel W. Michaels is a Columbia University graduate (Phi Beta Kappa, 1954) and a Fulbright exchange student to Germany (1957). Now retired after 40 years of service with the U.S. Department of Defense, he writes from his home in Washington, DC.




Stalin with his most trusted military advisor, Boris Shaposhnikov. Together they worked out a two-year mobilization plan that was to culminate in an attack against Germany in the summer of 1941 that would bring Europe under Soviet control.

Contending Factions

To the first group have belonged such notables as the late Marshal Georgi Zhukov, journalist Lev Bezymenski (also professor at the Academy of Military Sciences), General M. A. Gareyev, V. A. Anfilov, and Yu. A. Gorkov. This group, in general, also contends that Stalin had decapitated the Red Army by purging many high-ranking officers just before the war; that he was too trusting of Hitler, wrongly believing that the Führer would never deliberately initiate a two-front war; and that Stalin was the cause of Communism's failure. These views are shared by many, regardless of political leanings.

An Israeli, Gabriel Gorodetsky, much ballyhooed in the English-speaking world, also fits in this company. Gorodetsky is a colleague of Lev Bezymenski, as he was of the late General Dmitri Volkogonov. Gorodetsky, Suvorov contends, has been granted unparalleled access to selected archives of the Russian Foreign Min-



First page of the May 1941 top secret Soviet memorandum, shown here in facsimile (reduced), which lays out strategy for a military first strike against Germany and her allies. Using such terms as "a sudden strike," "pre-empt," and "offensive" war, it called for a lightning attack against East Prussia, Poland, Silesia and the Czech lands, thereby cutting Germany off from the Balkans and the Romanian oil fields, and a second military thrust directed against Romania. Hand-written in black ink, this document was prepared by Soviet general Vasilevski, and signed by Soviet General Staff chief Zhukov and Soviet defense commissar Timoshenko. It was submitted to Stalin on May 15, 1941.

istry, the General Staff, the NKVD, the GRU, and other records usually closed to researchers, above all revisionists, who might probe too deeply. For this reason Suvorov suspects Gorodetsky of being a conduit for information that the Russian government chooses to have disseminated.

To the second group belong military historians such as Viktor Suvorov, Mikhail Meltiukhov, V. A. Nevezhin,

V. D. Danilov, and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, as well as several Germans (Joachim Hoffmann, Wolfgang Strauss, Fritz Becker) and Austrians (Heinz Magenheimer, Ernst Topitsch). (See review of Topitsch's *Stalin's War* in JHR 8, no. 2 [summer 1988]). They argue that Stalin trusted no one, least of all Hitler; that Stalin had, together with Marshal Zhukov, devised his own plan for a surprise offensive against Germany, with the ultimate goal of establishing Communism in Europe; and that it was the USSR, not Germany, which was better prepared for war. Suvorov has also argued that Stalin's purges actually improved the Red Army, by ridding it of the heavy-handed political commissars, most of whom were Trotskyite thugs despised by the people. As is well known, many of Trotsky's followers were his fellow Jews, often foreign born rather than native to Russia.

The American historians Richard Raack and R. H. S. Stolfi (see review in JHR 15, no. 6 [Nov.-Dec. 1995]) have joined the debate, lending it a worldwide dimension. Professor Raack in particular has reinforced the arguments of the Suvorov group, writing that "in fact the discussion is now international ... the genie of truth is out of the bottle."

The first group has been taxed with harboring Stalinist apologists for the old Soviet Establishment, the second of seeking to justify Hitler's German invasion. Polemics aside, the historiographical roots of the division are manifest in the reliance of the first group on the Soviet political literature to substantiate its arguments, as opposed to the second group's reliance on historical analysis based on military science, studying and comparing troop deployments, weapons systems, and so on.

In the past few years, several major books have appeared from representatives of both sides of the dispute. Gorodetsky, supported in his research by many former Soviet Jews now residing in Israel, has recently published *Grand Delusion*. Widely circulated in the West, it has won the acclaim of most of its Anglo-American reviewers. The irrepressible Suvorov, who resides in England, has published his fourth major book on the war, entitled *Samoubiystvo* ("Suicide"), dealing with events immediately preceding the outbreak of hostilities, while Meltiukhov, currently associated with the All-Russian Scientific Research Institute of Documentation and Archival Science, has just published *Upushchenny shans Stalina* ("Stalin's Lost Opportunity"). Regrettably, with the exception of *Icebreaker*, none of Suvorov's and Meltiukhov's works are currently avail-

able in English, and they have only rarely been reviewed or evaluated in the English-speaking world. Finally, an excellent translation of *Stalin's War of Extermination*, by Joachim Hoffmann, historian at Germany's Military History Research Office (MGFA), has now been made available to English speakers. This book has gone through several editions in Germany and is widely read there.

Suvorov's works enjoy the greatest sales and circulation of serious Russian literature on the war. At first his opponents (almost all professional historians) tried to ignore him. Later, when compelled to recognize his work, they attempted to dismiss his theses as the product of a fantasist who had had no access to official documents whatsoever. Yet, working solely from Soviet open source literature on the war, Suvorov deduced the Soviet plan to invade Germany, predicting that in time official documents would be found to substantiate his conclusions. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, such documents have surfaced with increasing frequency, and in recent years Suvorov has found a perfect partner in Meltiukhov, who, with his experience in documentation and archival science and his easier access to Soviet-era records, has provided documentation for Suvorov's theses.

Plan of attack

The Zhukov Plan of May 15, 1941, discussed briefly in these pages last year (see JHR 19, no. 6 [Nov.-Dec. 2000]), continues to be the focus of analysis and discussion. Recently, on the fifty-ninth anniversary of the German attack, Vladimir Sergeyev described and published excerpts from the Zhukov document, which was discovered in the Archives of the President of the Russian Federation some years ago. For ultimate security, the original twelve-page text had been handwritten by then Major General, later Marshal, A. M. Vasilevski, and addressed to the chairman of the USSR Council of Peoples Commissars, Joseph Stalin. The document, marked "Top Secret! Of Great Importance! Stalin's Eyes Only! One Copy Only!" was authorized and approved by People's Defense Minister S. K. Timoshenko and Zhukov, then chief of the Red Army general staff.

A key passage in the war plan not previously cited in these pages reads:

In order to prevent a surprise German attack and to destroy the German Army, I consider it essential that under no circumstances should the initiative for freedom of action be given to the German High



Georgi Zhukov (1896-1974), perhaps the most outstanding Soviet general of World War II, shown here in a 1941 photograph. In 1939 he led the Soviet forces in Mongolia that dealt a stunning blow to the Japanese Kwantung Army in the great battle of Khalkin-Gol. During the period he served as Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet armed forces, January-July 1941, he signed the May 1941 memo to Stalin that outlined a massive military strike against Germany. From October 1941 through March 1942 Zhukov brilliantly directed the defense of Moscow. From August 1942 to January 1943 he and General Aleksandr Vasilevski organized the Soviet victory in the battle of Stalingrad, one of the most decisive in history. Zhukov later played a major role in the great battles of Kursk (1943) and Berlin (1945).

Command[. I consider it essential] to preempt enemy deployment, to attack the German Army when it is still in the stage of deployment and has not yet had time to organize his front and the interaction between his service arms.[The word for "preempt" was underlined twice in the original document. — D.M.]

Thus did Zhukov propose to Stalin precisely what the German Army would do to his forces a month later.

The Suvorov school and certain German military analysts speculate that Stalin's failure to attack before the German onslaught of June 22, 1941, was probably because his own forces had not yet fully deployed for the offensive. Sergeyev, on the other hand, suggests that


the attack plan prepared by Zhukov was faulty.

Upon his return from the successful blitzkrieg operation he had orchestrated in the battle of Khalkin-Gol in Mongolia (August 1939), Marshal Zhukov was put in charge of the Kiev Special Military District, where he commanded the Soviet Southwestern and Western fronts. His plan of May 15, 1941, assigned these fronts the task of destroying the Wehrmacht units before them, then advancing southwest across Poland to the German border. This operation was intended to cut German forces off from the Balkan theater of operations and from their Romanian and Hungarian allies, including their vital oil fields.

Zhukov was unaware that the main deployment of German forces was not on the Soviet left flank, but in Army Group Center, further to the north. Thus, had Soviet forces attacked toward Cracow-Lublin, as Zhukov's plan called for, Army Group Center could easily have cut through the exposed right (northern) flank of the Soviet thrust, upset the Soviet offensive, and then advanced along the Minsk-Smolensk line toward Moscow. In that event, the Red Army would have found itself in an even worse situation than after the outbreak of the actual German offensive on June 22. Zhukov admitted as much later to military historian V. A. Anfilov: "In retrospect it is good that he [Stalin] did not agree with us. Otherwise, our forces might have suffered a catastrophe."

Stalin's Aims

In a more detailed study of the May 15 document, L. A. Bezymenski notes that the plan had even more ambitious goals. After completion of the first stage of the offensive, Soviet forces were to turn north and northwest to destroy the northern wing of the German front, thereby occupying East Prussia and all of Poland. Meanwhile, to the north, the Red Army would once again invade Finland. According to Bezymenski, Zhukov's bold offensive plan had very probably been influenced by Stalin's speech of May 5 to Soviet military academy graduates, in which the Soviet leader empha-



Dr. Joachim Hoffmann served from 1960 until 1995 as a historian with the semi-official Military History Research Office (MGFA) in Freiburg. His detailed revisionist work, *Hitlers Vernichtungskrieg, 1941-1945*, has been published in English as *Hitler's War of Extermination*.

sized the superiority of offensive over defensive military planning.

Soviet mobilization and deployment in the period January-June 1941 took place in three stages:

- first stage, January-March, the call-up of about a million reservists, industry ordered to step up production of T-34 and KV tanks, first echelon troops brought up to strength;
- second stage, April-June, second echelon forces moved up to the western border, Far Eastern troops moved west;
- third stage, June 1-June 22, Stalin agrees to open mobilization and to advancing second echelon armies to the front. All these operations were to be carried out in secrecy, without the enemy taking note. Once mobilized and in position, the Soviet forces were to launch a sudden, decisive offensive against Germany and her allies.

According to Meltiukhov, the correlation of forces along the front from Ostroleka (Poland) to the Carpathians at the time of the planned Zhukov offensive was as shown in the table below.

	Red Army	Wehrmacht	Ratio
Divisions	128	55	2.3:1
Troop strength	3,400,000	1,400,000	2.1:1
Field guns	38,500	16,300	2.4:1
Tanks	7,500	900	8.7:1
Aircraft	6,200	1,400	4.4:1

The attack was to begin in typical blitzkrieg fashion — without warning, with air raids on enemy airfields, and with heavy artillery bombardment of front-line enemy forces. The USSR would thus have had the clear advantage of superior forces and the benefits of the first strike. Why Stalin did not give the order to attack is unknown.

In "Stalin's Lost Opportunity," Meltiukhov establishes, with meticulous documentation, that in the years 1938-40 the Soviet Union had carried out a massive build-up of military muscle that made it the super-

	UK	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	USSR	Japan	USA
Divisions	25	32	51	67	30	126	41	11
Troop strength (thousands)	1662	1005	1343	1753	465	2485	1420	534
Field guns	13000	26546	30679	20000	50000	55790	?	?
Tanks	547	3286	3419	1390	887	21110	2000	300
Aircraft	5113	3959	4288	2938	824	1167	3180	2473

power of the day, far exceeding the might of any enemy. Meltiukhov presents the comparative strength of the major belligerents for August 1939, on the eve of Germany's invasion of Poland, as shown in the table above.

Accounting for Stalin's Delay

Meltiukhov minces no words on Stalin's intent: "The content of the Soviet operational plans, the ideological guidelines and the military propaganda, combined with information on the immediate military preparations of the Red Army for an offensive, attest unambiguously to the intention of the Soviet government to attack Germany in the summer of 1941." He concludes that at first the opening strike against Germany (Operation *Groza* [Thunderstorm]) was scheduled for June 12, 1941, but that the Kremlin later fatefully shifted the date to July 15. According to Meltiukhov: "Unfortunately, what we now know today was a secret in 1941. The Soviet leadership made a fateful miscalculation by not striking first."

Meltiukhov speculates that Stalin delayed the date for the attack when he learned, on May 12, of Rudolf Hess' flight to Scotland. Stalin feared that if the Hess peace mission succeeded, and the British withdrew from the war, the Red Army would be left to stand alone against the Germans. When it became clear that the Hess mission had failed, Stalin set July 15 as the date for Operation Thunderstorm — twenty-three days after Hitler launched Operation Barbarossa. Had the Red Army attacked on the originally scheduled date, Meltiukhov believes, it would have succeeded.

Although Soviet intelligence had been informed of the precise date of the German attack by its agent Richard Sorge in Japan, and by its "Korsikanets" and "Starshina" sources in Berlin, Stalin refused to be convinced. Moreover, Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt had also warned Stalin, to no avail: Stalin knew that Britain desperately needed the USSR in the war against Germany for its own sake. By failing to strike first, as planned, the USSR lost 800,000 men

(Germany, 80,000), 4,000 aircraft (Germany, 850), 21,500 field guns and 11,800 tanks (Germany, 400) during the first two and a half weeks of the war. By the end of 1941 the Soviet Union had lost three million Red Army troops.

Meltiukhov rejects the term "preventive war." For a true preventive war, it is necessary for the attacker to know definitely that his adversary is about to invade. Meltiukhov maintains that, while the each side was aware of the other's build-up and deployment of forces, neither the Germans nor the Russians knew with certainty that the other was about to attack. Stalin believed, with some logic, that Hitler would never open a second front while the Britain was still in the war, but the German leader chose not to wait until the Red Army launched its attack: he unleashed his own blitzkrieg. The situation best resembles two cats sitting on a fence waiting to see which will jump off first. On the day before the attack, Hitler signaled his frame of mind in a letter to Mussolini:

Even if I were forced to lose 60-70 divisions in Russia by the end of the year, this would still only be a small fraction of the forces I would have to maintain constantly on the eastern border under the present conditions.

In the end Germany failed, Meltiukhov states, simply because it had neither the resources nor the reserves necessary to bring a long war to a successful conclusion.

A Suicidal Invasion?

The ever controversial, iconoclastic Suvorov dedicates his new book to his adversaries. He writes, "You can't dedicate a book with this title [*Ledokol*, or "Suicide"] to friends, so I dedicate it to my enemies." An enemy of the Soviet regime who defected to England, Suvorov was tried in absentia and sentenced to death. Although his opponents are legion, including many in the post-Soviet as well as the Anglo-American establishments, in today's Russia he is the *most popular* writer on the history of the Second World War.



Russian historian Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun) addressed about 200 persons at the University of Salzburg in Austria on May 21, 2001. A dozen leftist thugs stormed the podium in the lecture hall to prevent him from speaking. However, several of those in audience, including Austrian military servicemen, forcibly ejected the disrupters. In this photo, several young men protect the bearded scholar.

Suvorov joins Meltiukhov in the belief that if any side was unprepared for the war that ensued, it was the Germans. On June 22, 1941 when Germany launched its desperate attack, Stalin had some 13,000 aircraft to Hitler's 2,500. Moreover, the Red Army had an even greater advantage in numbers and quality of tanks (24,000:3,700).

In "Suicide" Suvorov analyzes secondary sources in German, just as he did in his books on Russian war plans, and concludes that Hitler had lost the war even before the first shot was fired. It is Suvorov's contention that Hitler and the Nazi leadership were irresponsible in launching a war against the much larger, better prepared, and better armed Soviet Union in the absurd belief that the USSR could be defeated in ninety days — July-August-September. Hitler and the German high command unpardonably underestimated the strength of the Soviet armed forces, which Stalin had been building up since the mid-1920s. Germany, of course, did not begin rearming until the mid-1930s, and would delay mobilizing for total war until around 1943.

Stalin and his advisors knew that the Wehrmacht lacked all the essentials for a protracted war under conditions of extreme cold. Through their intelligence ser-

vices and agents, the Soviets had learned that: German tanks were inferior to their own in both quantity and quality; Germany was critically short of oil; Germany did not manufacture cold-resistant lubricants; the German forces had not been issued winter clothing; Germany was dependent for its war effort on the import of many raw materials; and much more.

Exasperated by the short-sighted, superficial German plan for victory in three months, Suvorov asks a few rhetorical questions: Did Hitler think that May followed October in Russia? Had he learned nothing from Napoleon's campaign? Did he not know that, even if he reached Moscow, Russia would have continued the war from the Urals in the interior, far beyond the reach of German long-range bombers?

By the end of the fourth month of Barbarossa, the German economy was already groaning. Fritz Todt, chief of arms production, advised Hitler to arrange for an armistice. Large-scale German tank operations had to be curtailed for lack of fuel. The German panzer units, with their limited number of tanks, were often forced to cover long distances to quell unforeseen exigencies, thereby further exhausting fuel supplies. (Large-scale blitzkrieg operations, ensuring the greatest possible encirclement and bag of prisoners, require that the tanks moving out from one pincer proceed with minimum diversion in order to meet those jumping off from the other pincer, thereby closing the encirclement.)

Beyond the Propaganda

Suvorov's list of villains is long indeed. Hitler, Goebbels, and the subservient German generals are castigated for their recklessness. But Suvorov's venom is mostly directed at the Communist and post-Communist establishment, whose spokesmen continue to mouth the Party line. He ridicules and mocks what he considers the falsehoods, misconceptions, myths, and errors about the German-Russian war invented and circulated by the various Soviet and post-Soviet "scientific institutes," including the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Institute of Military History, whose researchers have tried to dismiss Suvorov's findings as "unscientific."

Suvorov dismisses typical official Soviet sources for the war as specious propaganda devoid of hard facts or figures. The main message of the original six-volume *History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, 1941-45*, Suvorov contends, is that Nikita Khrushchev

(under whose administration the work was compiled) won the war single-handedly. Suvorov goes on to observe that when the twelve-volume revised edition of this official history was written under Leonid Brezhnev, it was revised to show that it was actually Brezhnev who had won the Great Patriotic War.

Suvorov singles out the memoirs of Marshal Zhukov for special criticism. He hazards that these were probably written by Glavpur (the Main Political Directorate of the Red Army). Thus “Zhukov” writes that on June 22, 1941, the Germans enjoyed a 5-6:1 advantage over Soviet forces in field pieces, tanks and aircraft, when in fact the ratio was to Russia’s advantage.

Suvorov considers Stalin to have been Hitler’s superior in cleverness, rationality, emotional stability, international politics, cruelty, and blood-letting. Stalin was much better informed about German capabilities than Hitler was of Russian. Suvorov introduces a Russian adage to demean Hitler’s attempt to outwit Stalin: “Never try to trick a trickster.” The only reason for Hitler’s initial success, for Suvorov, was that Barbarossa was an entirely irrational decision, which the thoroughly logical Stalin could not possibly have anticipated. In the opinion of this reviewer, that was precisely why Hitler took the gamble. Suvorov’s Russian nativism shines forth when he writes: “Only a fool would consider defeating Russia! Only a complete idiot would ever think of defeating it in a three-month campaign!”

As brilliant as Suvorov has been in exposing the historical lies of the corrupt Communist and post-Communist regimes, even sympathetic readers must take issue with him on certain points. As with Heinrich Schliemann’s discovery of Troy, Suvorov’s findings may not satisfy the more professional historians in every detail — and some of them will be subject to revision.

Overrating Stalin

Occasionally Suvorov contradicts himself. For example, he argues that when Hitler turned his troops southward to Kiev before Moscow was taken, he all but lost the war. But elsewhere Suvorov recognizes that in war the best strategy is to defeat the enemy’s armed forces, not to take prestige cities. In fact the German forces turned south not so much to take Kiev as to destroy another Soviet army. The German generals, who after all had some experience in the conduct of war, were of course perfectly aware of the pointlessness of capturing large cities merely for trophy value. When the enemy’s armed forces are destroyed, his cities will




Nikita Khrushchev on the bank of the San river in Poland, Sept. 29, 1939, in the aftermath of the German-Soviet subjugation of the Polish republic. After Stalin’s death, Khrushchev was premier of the Soviet Union, 1953-1964. In his memoir, he recalled:

“We knew perfectly well that Hitler was trying to trick us with the [August 1939 German-Soviet non-aggression] treaty. I heard with my own ears how Stalin said, ‘Of course its all a game to see who can fool whom. I know what Hitler’s up to. He thinks he’s outsmarted me, but actually its I who have tricked him!’ ... We weren’t fooling ourselves. We knew that eventually we would be drawn into the war, although I suppose Stalin hoped that the English and the French might exhaust Hitler and foil his plan to crush the West first and then to turn east.... The Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of 1939 ... was like a gambit in chess: if we hadn’t made that move, the [1941-1945 German-Soviet] war should have started earlier, much to our disadvantage. As it was, we were given a respite.”

Source: *Khrushchev Remembers* (Boston: 1970), pp. 128-129.

fall on their own.

Only in the case of Stalingrad did the German invaders commit all their forces and energies to take a city — with disastrous results. The previous winter, after the failure to take Moscow, reason had prevailed and the Germans retreated to a more defensible line, where they were able to regroup and reinforce their armies. Without the help of the Finns, German forces were inadequate to take Leningrad, so they bypassed the city. But Hitler forbade any retreat from Stalingrad. Its capture had been aimed, among other things, at blocking oil shipments up the Volga north to the Soviets. The Wehrmacht was no less concerned to fuel its own war machine: it had secured the Crimea in order to



General Alfred Jodl, center, makes a point about the military situation during a briefing with Hitler and General Wilhelm Keitel.

protect its chief sources of petroleum, in Romania and Hungary, from Soviet air attack from that peninsula.

Suvorov's excessive regard for Stalin's leadership and his equally overdone criticism of Hitler's ignores the fact that Germany nearly did defeat the Red Army. Had the United States, Great Britain, France, and other allies not supported Stalin with arms, trucks, provisions, and other necessities of war, the outcome might have been quite different. It must also be recalled that, throughout much of the long Russian-German conflict, Germany was compelled to divert twenty to thirty percent of its war effort to the Western front.

Suvorov's main contention, that Stalin groomed Hitler to do his dirty work in Europe, is untenable. It gives far too much credit to the Soviet dictator. Germany never wanted a war in the west, let alone one against Britain. True, the Germans suspected France — especially under the government of Léon Blum's popular front — of further mischief.

It must be recalled that Germany's ill-fated attack on the Soviet Union followed several successive attempts at its encirclement by its enemies. In the 1930s British and French diplomacy had succeeded in surrounding her with hostile nations. Then came the attempted Scandinavian and Balkan encirclement, and finally that of the U.S., UK, and USSR. With both Soviet and Western forces increasing in strength, Germany took a desperate gamble to break the ring, rather than wait until the Red Army seized the most opportune time to pounce.

True, the gamble failed. Today's Germany, however, is a prosperous country, much smaller than it might have wished, but the remnant of Stalin's USSR, stripped of the Tsar's empire, is not much more than an overgrown economic basket case.

Suvorov exaggerates Stalin's "genius." While it is true that he created a police state and built up the Red Army to superpower status, his armed forces failed miserably at the time they were most needed, June 1941. It is also true that Stalin dominated Churchill and Roosevelt, above all in the several conferences that determined postwar arrangements among the "Big Three," but the Western leaders had cast themselves in the role of supplicants who needed the Red Army to contain and destroy Germany.

For all that, Suvorov has made a great contribution to correcting the history of the Second World War by dispelling, once and for all, the myth of a peace-loving Soviet Union invented by Communist propagandists and circulated in the West by their dupes and sympathizers.

Trusting Stalin

According to Gorodetsky's version of the Soviet Union, the USSR planned only counter-attacks in defense of the homeland, and its leader, Stalin, was too trusting of Adolf Hitler. Gorodetsky completely ignores the Soviet Union's military build-up from the 1930s until the outbreak of hostilities in 1941. The tens of thousands of advanced tanks and aircraft; the training of hundreds of thousands of paratroopers; the forward deployment of airfields, depots, and attack units on the eve of the attack in June 1941 are all hard evidence of Stalin's real intentions.

The Israeli researcher has limited himself almost entirely to examining statements from official Soviet sources. For the most part, he ignores military analysts (whether Russian, German, or American), who are better equipped than he to evaluate military capabilities and designs. These researchers tend increasingly to agree with Suvorov.

Gorodetsky retains the stale support of the old Soviet establishment, while Suvorov has gained many post-Soviet adherents in recent years. While Gorodetsky is read mostly in England and the United States, erstwhile allies of Stalinist Russia, Suvorov is read widely in Russia and Germany, whose peoples experienced Stalin's and Hitler's war first hand.

No Room for Chivalry

In *Stalin's War of Extermination* Joachim Hoffmann examines both the underlying causes and the ruthless execution of the war by Russians and Germans alike, in a thoroughly engrossing, systematic approach that is unsurpassed with respect to comprehensiveness, objectivity, and documentation. Hoffmann has made extensive use of interrogations of Soviet prisoners of war, ranging in rank from general to private, conducted by their German captors during the war. These interviews, combined with the traditional exploitation of open-source, unclassified literature and recently declassified materials, irrefutably dispel the myth of a peace-loving Soviet Union led by a trusting, pacific Joseph Stalin. Hoffmann's research confirms conclusively that the Soviet Union was making final preparations for its own preemptive attack when the Wehrmacht struck.

Besides the POW interrogations, Hoffmann cites such military authorities as Dmitri Volkogonov, to the effect that Stalin needed only a few more weeks to bring his forces into complete battle readiness; Soviet military analyst Colonel Danilov, who agrees that the "vozhd" (commander) only needed a bit more time; and Colonel Karpov, who has written:

In the early grayness of a May or June morning, thousands of our aircraft and tens of thousands of our guns would have dealt the blow against the densely concentrated German force, whose positions were known down to battalion level — a surprise even more inconceivable than the German attack on us.

Hoffmann contends that war between these two mutually hostile, ideologically driven nations was inevitable: it was merely a question of which side would initiate hostilities. He reminds that the First World War had brought Communism to power over the one sixth of the one sixth of the Earth's surface that had been the Russian empire. A second world war, Lenin preached, would advance Communism throughout Europe. Stalin, Lenin's faithful disciple in propagating Communism, acted from the outset of his rule to increase the USSR's military might to that end. By 1941, the Red Army's aircraft, tanks, and field artillery exceeded Germany's by a factor of at least six to one in each category. In that year, the USSR's paratroops and submarines, exclusively offensive forces, exceeded those of the rest of the world combined.

The main principles of Soviet military doctrine in the spring of 1941 were: 1) the Red Army is an offensive



Soviet troops hoist the red hammer and sickle flag over the Reichstag in Berlin, an act that symbolized the Soviet subjugation of eastern and central Europe. The Battle of Berlin climaxed the titanic struggle of German and Soviet forces that began on June 22, 1941.

army; 2) war must always be fought on enemy territory, with minimum friendly losses and the total destruction of the enemy; 3) the working class in the enemy's country is a potential ally and should be encouraged to rebel against its masters; and 4) war preparations must serve to ensure offensive capabilities.

So confident was Stalin of Soviet military superiority, Hoffmann asserts, that he doubted Germany would ever be foolish enough to attack, especially as long as Britain remained in the war. Dumbfounded at the German successes at the outset of Barbarossa, the Soviet dictator realized that he had underestimated Germany's chances of defeating the Red Army. Suvorov has described Stalin's probable state of mind as comparable to that of the designer of the *Titanic* after learning it had

sunk. Nevertheless, vowing vengeance, still confident of ultimate victory, Stalin demanded the total extermination of the German invaders. On November 6, 1941, he declared:

Well now, if the Germans want a war of extermination, they will get it. From now on it will be our task, the task of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the task of our fighters, commanders, and the political officials of our Army and Navy to exterminate to the last man all Germans who have invaded Homeland as occupiers. No mercy to the German occupiers! Death to the German occupiers!

Hitler, for his part, by underestimating the military strength of the Soviet Union, led his country to a catastrophic defeat. Goebbels, in his diary, suggested that had Hitler known the actual strength of the Red Army, he might have at least paused before taking his fateful gamble. Yet, however disastrous the Axis attack finally proved for the German nation in the end, Hoffmann believes that all Europe would have suffered as grim a fate had the Red Army succeeded in striking first.

This clash to the death between two ideologically driven states, Hoffmann observes, left no room for chivalry, or for the strict observance of international conventions on land warfare. Stalin insisted that Soviet soldiers not surrender, and used maximal terror to prevent them from doing so. Soviet POWs were deemed deserters, and any Soviet soldier who surrendered was to be killed on falling into Soviet hands. (Near the end of the war German soldiers who refused to fight were shot and hanged from lamp posts for all to see.) Throughout the Great Patriotic War, as the Soviets dubbed it, "Soviet patriotism" and "mass heroism" were heavily dependent on terrorism. As Hoffmann writes, the head of Red Army Political Propaganda, Commissar Lev Sakharovich Mekhlis, was empowered by Stalin to use every device of terror to keep the Red Army fighting. This Mekhlis did with relish. In consequence of the activity of this and other commissars, Stalin's terror against his own people (soldiers and civilians) during the war accounted for a substantial percentage of the estimated twenty-five million Soviet war dead. (See also Walter Sanning's essay on Soviet losses, "Soviet Scorched-Earth Warfare," in JHR 6, no. 1 [spring 1985]). Even so, more than five million Soviet soldiers managed to surrender to the invaders by the end of the war. Of those who survived the war, many had cause to wish they hadn't following their repatriation to the USSR.

Unpunished Crimes, Aggressive Plans

From the onset of the war, German soldiers unfortunate enough to be taken prisoner were often mutilated and murdered. When the Soviet forces entered Germany, men and boys were murdered or drafted for forced labor; the women were often raped, sometimes murdered, and, if strong enough, dragooned for forced labor.

Although by about 1950 Stalin decided to lessen the influence of Jews in the Communist Party, Jews were very much involved in murderous assignments during the war. In addition to Mekhlis, there was Lazar Kaganovich, responsible for the deaths of millions; General Abakumov, who headed the NKVD/MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs, or secret police), and Generals Reichman and Chernyakhovski, who were especially ruthless. Hoffmann hastens to add that the criminal actions of individual Jews should no more reflect on the Jewish people as a whole than the criminal actions of individual Nazis on the German people. Yet Nazis charged with war crimes have been, and continue to be, tried and punished, while, curiously, no courts appear to be interested in bringing Communist criminals to justice.

The thoroughness and reliability of Hoffmann's work (which helpfully includes an appendix containing key original documents in Polish, Russian, English, and German) is nicely exemplified in his treatment of Zhukov's plan of May 15, 1941. While Sergeyev and Bezymenski seem to suggest that the plan was only recently discovered, Hoffmann makes manifestly clear that the plan has long been known and analyzed. Colonel Valeri Danilov and Dr. Heinz Magenheimer examined this plan and other documents that indicate Soviet preparations for attack almost ten years ago in an Austrian military journal (*Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift*, nos. 5 and 6, 1991; no. 1, 1993; and no. 1, 1994). Both researchers concluded that the Zhukov plan of May 15, 1941, reflected Stalin's May 5, 1941 speech (see above) heralding the birth of the new offensive Red Army. Hoffmann reproduces an original document, referred to as "Short Notation of Comrade Stalin's Speech to the Red Army Academy on May 5, 1941," which concludes with the words:

But now that we have reconstructed our army and abundantly saturated it with the technology to wage modern warfare, now that we have become strong — now we are obliged to go from defense to attack. In defending our country we are obliged to act in an offensive manner. To switch over from defense to a

military policy of offensive action. We must reconstruct our training, our propaganda, our agitation, and our press in the spirit of attack. The Red Army is now a modern army, and a modern army is an army of attack.

The Zhukov plan of May 15, 1941, indicates clearly that the Red Army planned a preemptive strike against the German forces across the border. Hoffmann further notes that a few days later, on May 20, 1941, Mikhail Kalinin, then chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet and nominally head of state, gave a speech in which he said:

War is a very dangerous business, laden with sorrows, but when a time comes when it is possible to expand the realm of Communism, war should not be discounted ... and the zone of Communism must be expanded. The capitalist world can only be destroyed by the red hot glowing steel of a holy revolutionary war.

Kalinin thus strongly implied that the war the USSR was about to wage was not a preventive war forced upon it by Germany, but a war of conquest to expand the Communist empire.

The Perfect Storm

The preponderance of documents uncovered in the past decade, including further analyses of the Zhukov plan of May 15, 1941, by members of the Suvorov school, should convince the impartial reader that: Germany was woefully unprepared for a long war; that the Soviet Union was not only armed to the teeth, but poised to spring in July 1941; that Stalin was Lenin's disciple in striving to advance Communism to the rest of Europe, especially to Germany; and that the governments of Britain and France were totally oblivious of the greater danger Communism posed to them when they declared war on Germany over its border dispute with Poland. The failure of the British, French, and American leaderships to perceive that the Soviet Union was by far the deadlier threat, even in 1939, was a mistake that has taken half a century to rectify, at the cost of countless millions of lives.

Hoffmann concludes that the war between the two irreconcilable ideologies was inevitable and unavoidable. Stalin's fanatical adherence to Communism (class hatred) and Hitler's equally fanatical adherence to racial theories (Hoffmann cites Disraeli: "The race question is the key to world history") led their peoples to a catastrophe unmatched since the Thirty Years' War.

Hoffmann blames the horrible excesses the Red Army inflicted on German civilians on hate-obsessed war propagandists such as Ilya Ehrenburg in Russia who deliberately exaggerated German crimes. Thus, Hoffman notes, Ehrenburg announced a death toll of four million for Auschwitz on January 4, 1945, weeks before the capture of the camp. Likewise, months before the war's end, Ehrenburg reported that six million Jews had been murdered by the Germans. Moreover, in many instances, including the infamous Katyn forest massacre of Polish prisoners, Red propagandists shamelessly tried to blame the German army for crimes committed by the Soviets.

Like his colleague Wolfgang Strauss, Hoffmann advocates reconciliation between the peoples of Germany and Russia. The policies of both Stalin's Communist regime and Hitler's National Socialist state were aberrations far removed from the traditional friendship between the two peoples as prevailed under Bismarck and before him. In that spirit Hoffmann makes special mention of Drs. Heinz Magenheimer, Werner Maser, Ernst Topitsch, Günther Gillessen, Alfred M. de Zayas, Viktor Suvorov, and also Aleksandr Moiseevich Nekrich and Lev Kopelev, two former Soviet wartime commissars of Jewish extraction, for their courageous contributions to revisionist history. (Nor has Hoffmann been less than courageous: he testified in a German court to the scholarly quality of Germar Rudolf's Holocaust revisionist anthology, *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, later published in English as *Dissecting the Holocaust*.)

The extreme economic and political conditions that afflicted much of the first half of the twentieth century devastated Germany and Russia. The slaughter of the First World War, the triumph of Communism in Russia, the treaty of Versailles, and the Great Depression combined to culminate in the political storm of the century, the Second World War, much as unique and unforeseen meteorological conditions in October 1991 — three merging hurricanes — combined to create what writer Sebastian Junger called "the perfect storm," a devastating "nor'easter" in the North Atlantic. In historians such as Suvorov and Hoffmann, the historical tempest of the twentieth century is, increasingly, finding able and objective chroniclers.

Pearl Harbor: Case Closed?

Day of Deceit: The Truth about FDR and Pearl Harbor by Robert B. Stinnett. New York: Simon and Schuster, Touchstone, 2000. Paperback. 399 pages. Index, illustrations, maps.

Pearl Harbor Betrayed: The True Story of a Man and a Nation under Attack by Michael Gannon. New York: Henry Holt, 2001. Hardcover. 340 pages. Index, illustrations, maps.

REVIEWED BY THEODORE O'KEEFE

As the sixtieth anniversary of what President Franklin Roosevelt called "a date which will live in infamy" (and who would know that better than he?) passes, the controversy over Pearl Harbor is as lively as ever. In no other area of the history of the Second World War have revisionists had quite as much success in convincing a broad section of public that the official version has it wrong: that it is President Franklin Roosevelt, not local commanders General Walter Short and Admiral Husband Kimmel, who should bear the blame for the devastating Japanese attack.

Two recent books argue that Admiral Husband Kimmel, in particular, was gravely wronged by his superiors, not merely after December 7, 1941, but in the weeks and months before. One, Robert Stinnett's *Day of Deceit*, is radically revisionist, claiming to abound in new evidence for a conspiracy involving the president, the war and navy departments, the army chief of staff, and the chief of naval operations, among many other participants. The other, Michael Gannon's *Pearl Harbor Betrayed*, makes no explicit accusations of conspiracy, nor does it seriously fault America's confrontational diplomacy vis-a-vis Japan in the years leading up to the attack. Odd as it might seem, this reviewer found the second the more satisfying book.

Stinnett has worked for many years on the question of whether American leaders, civilian and military, had foreknowledge of the Japanese attack on America's army and navy bases on Oahu. His review of the diplomatic evidence merely confirms what Charles Beard, George Morgenstern, Harry Elmer Barnes, Charles Callan Tansill, Percy Greaves, James Martin, and other revisionists have firmly established: that Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and Secretary of War Henry Stimson desired, and provoked, war with Japan, and that they certainly knew that Japan was going to

war a day or more before the December 7 attacks (which hit U.S. bases in the Philippines as well).

Stinnett's attempts to establish that America's civilian and military leadership was, or should have been, privy to the Japanese plans for Pearl Harbor through the interception and reading of certain of Japan's naval codes is harder to credit. A fair amount of his case rests on a sizable number of messages from ships and units of the Japanese navy that Stinnett was able to make public for the first time, not without diligent effort, under provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. It is difficult for a layman to interpret the significance of these documents, however, for Stinnett often fails to provide such key details as how they were routed and when they were read. Many of Japan's pre-Pearl Harbor messages were decoded only after the war.

A central contention of *Day of Deceit* is that American cryptanalysts solved the main operational code of the Japanese navy (designated as the "5-Num code," for its five number groups, by the code breakers) well in advance of the post-Pearl Harbor solution date accepted by most historians. On page 71 Stinnett writes that not only the Americans, but also the British, the Dutch, and the Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese had solved the 5-Num code by fall of 1941. Here, however, he is writing of three other codes as well, so the reader must leaf back to page 23 to discover that "Recovery [of the 5-Num code] was effected [by the U.S.] before April [1941]."

But what does Stinnett mean by "recovery"? In numerous passages he implies that the code was fully cracked and readable by the date he has given, and an uncared reader of his pages 73-81, the section of *Day of Deceit* that deals most thoroughly with the decoding of the 5-Num code, will likely take it that this was the case. Yet Stinnett supplies little documentation about just how much of this key Japanese naval code — the U.S. Navy's ability to read it was the key to the stunning American victory at Midway in June 1942 — could be understood before Pearl Harbor; none of his sources demonstrates that more than a small fraction of the chief operational code of the Japanese fleet could be read until later. His habit of grouping facts under a blanket statement that doesn't cover all of them can't disguise that what he calls on page 73 "an example of Num-5 and SM [ship movement code] decryption" turns out to have been merely an example of SM code decryption. Stinnett could have spared his readers a



The wreck of an American B-17 bomber at Hickam air field, Hawaii, December 7, 1941. After being attacked while in the air by Japanese fighter planes, it came down in flames and broke in half upon hitting the ground.

good deal of confusion and frustration by featuring more prominently a statement, buried at the bottom of a long footnote, that seems to be his clearest and most unambiguous statement on the matter: "There is no reliable evidence, found by the author, that establishes how much of the 5-Num text could be deciphered, translated, and read by naval cryptographers in 1941." (p. 334, n. 18)

Stinnett hasn't made things any easier for his readers by his often disconcerting manner of exposition. Although a retired journalist, Stinnett tends to over-complicate his story. His exposition, particularly in the first several chapters, is complicated, and sometimes nightmarish, for he makes repeated, arbitrary cuts back and forth, both in theme and chronology. Whether these jarring shifts are due to authorial woolgathering and editorial negligence, or whether they are part of some deliberate purpose, they make concentrating on the facts a constant chore. In turn, the frequent jumps force endless repetition, which does little to smooth the muddy flow. Just as bad, he can be a master at deflating his own suspense: *Day of Deceit* begins with breathless account of Edward R. Murrow's claim that he had gotten the biggest story of his life at a meeting with FDR on the evening of December 7 ("The Biggest Story of My Life"), but the biggest story turns out to be ... nothing. "In the end, Murrow's story remained unwritten and


unbroadcast."

Stinnett makes much of a memorandum that he discovered in the National Archives and which he believes explains U.S. policy toward Japan from October 1940 on. Written by the chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence's Far East desk, Lieutenant Commander Arthur McCollum, the eight-part memorandum calls for U.S. diplomatic and military measures, in conjunction with British and Dutch forces in the South Pacific, aimed at driving the Japanese to the wall. These measures included imposing a total embargo on Japan, aiding Chiang Kai-shek, and moving U.S. forces westward, to include bases in Singapore and the Dutch East Indies, and the basing of the "main strength" of the U.S. fleet in the vicinity of the Hawaiian islands. Confrontational though these proposals were, Stinnett is not able to show that Roosevelt or any other high official ever saw them. Several were not adopted, including the proposed colonial bases; one or two were in force before the memorandum; in one case the author has equated a handful of U.S. cruiser sorties in and around Japanese waters (most of them near Japanese mandates in the Pacific) with the stationing of a division of heavy cruisers in the Far East. In any case, the McCollum memorandum would seem to be incidental to Roosevelt's and the well-known Japanophobe Stimson's growing need for a "back door to war."

of its defenses, diverting ships from the Pacific Fleet to anti-German purposes in the Atlantic, and sending patrol planes and advanced fighter planes desperately needed in Hawaii to Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Gannon provides a thorough, even vivid account of Kimmel's efforts to get his fleet battle ready. As he notes, the fleet's anti-aircraft guns were manned and firing within four minutes of the opening of the attack, but their guns were out of date and nearly useless against fast, low-flying planes.

Gannon pretty much toes the line regarding a unilaterally aggressive Japan; on the other hand, he is quite acute in noting the progressive violations of neutrality by FDR in his undeclared naval war in the Atlantic in alliance with England. Here the research he has done in conjunction with *Operation Drumbeat*, his much hailed account of the initial German submarine campaign against American shipping, and other works continues to prove its worth. He has even discovered orders from Admiral King, commander of Atlantic fleet, to the captains of his escort ships authorizing them to shoot on sight in July 1941, well before FDR's issuance of that order following the *Greer* incident in September. Gannon makes clear that he is at least mildly contemptuous of such Roosevelt stratagems as decreeing that the Western Hemisphere extended to the east of Azores, or occupying Iceland (which he compares to the Japanese occupation of Indochina).

Pearl Harbor Betrayed offers a detailed and careful account of all the major issues in the Kimmel case. In nearly every instance the author comes down on the admiral's side, and against his political and naval superiors in Washington. Gannon methodically demonstrates that Kimmel could not have done a better job of air reconnaissance with the planes available to him, and that he was denied key intelligence, including access to Japan's top-secret diplomatic code (called "Purple") and to reports from a Japanese naval spy in Honolulu that clearly indicated an attack on Pearl Harbor (all of this intelligence was made available to U.S. commanders in ... the Philippines!). Gannon is at his best in parsing the key orders Kimmel received from Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner, Chief of Naval Operations Harold Stark, and Secretary of War Henry Stimson in the final weeks and days before the attack: steeped in naval procedure, he shows that Kimmel, after being left blind by his superiors, was given imprecise, misleading, and wrongheaded directives that all but left him and his fleet sitting ducks. His defense of Admiral Kimmel



Admiral H.E. Kimmel during a relaxed moment, prior to his appointment as commander of the U.S. Pacific fleet.

makes the 1995 finding by Undersecretary of Defense Edwin Dorn that Kimmel and Short were not solely responsible for the fiasco, and the recent recommendation of Congress that the admiral be restored to his highest wartime rank, all the more satisfying.

Little of this, except for Gannon's grasp of detail and bloodhound's instinct for sources, is new to knowledgeable revisionists. And revisionists will rightly cavil at Gannon's reluctance to lay more than a kind of procedural blame on Stark, Turner, et al., let alone Franklin Roosevelt, whom he seems to acquit in a footnote aimed at Gore Vidal's unblushingly conspiratorial novel *Golden Age* (*leitmotiv*: FDR? Did he *ever* know!):

One need not hold FDR to blame for what happened at Pearl Harbor if one's wish is to exonerate Kimmel and Short. One need only cite the faithlessness and ineptitude of the war and Navy Departments, about which much has been written in these pages. (p. 363, n. 62)



Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, commanding general of the U.S. Army's Hawaiian Department.

Bad as that sounds, Stinnett's fulsome tributes to Roosevelt are worse, for he tells us that none of the numerous treacheries he attributes to Roosevelt throughout *Day of Deceit* "diminish Franklin Delano Roosevelt's magnificent contributions to the American people." What both authors really mean to say, of course, is that Holocaustomania is alive and well, and that any questioning of America's entry in the great anti-fascist crusade is liable to render one an accomplice to the most recently discovered Holocaust crime.

The more important of these two books, *Day of Deceit* (if only for its ambition), may provide some new evidence for a conspiracy including FDR as well as his underlings, but seems untrustworthy. *Pearl Harbor Betrayed* is well worth reading, for its up-to-date consideration of the key questions as well as for the reasons stated above, but shies away from uncovering a conspiracy. The book that solves the Pearl Harbor mystery, however, remains unwritten.

Could You Survive a Nuclear Attack?

Why I Survived The A-Bomb

By Akira Kohchi (Albert Kawachi)

Until now, the *real* story of the first nuclear holocaust had not been told. Previous books on the atomic bombings of Hiroshima approached it only obliquely: technical works hailed it as a marvel of nuclear science, and books written from the military perspective honored the men who gave and carried out a difficult order. Even the eyewitness accounts, numbering some two thousand — and almost all yet to be translated from the Japanese — are overwhelmingly stories of *personal* misery. The total picture — the background, scope, and consequences of the catastrophe — has, until now, never been presented.

Why I Survived the A-Bomb tells a unique and fascinating story as seen from inside Japan 48 years ago and today. The author is eminently qualified — he lived through the experience of a nuclear attack and walked through the flaming, radioactive city of Hiroshima!

Albert Kawachi, a longtime United Nations finance officer, explores the attempts at political and economic justifications for the atom-bombing as he describes the day-to-day living experiences of his family in its wake. His story is dramatic, informative, and historically revisionist.

What was it really like to survive the massive devastation, then deal with the suffering and humiliation wrought by this American doomsday weapon? Who was behind the use of the bomb in the first place? And what did it really accomplish? We need real answers to these hard questions before we speak glibly of defense and disarmament, and before we argue over trade imbalances and deficits, for what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could be our tomorrow.

Chapters include: At the Beginning • The Pacific • The Home Battleground • Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 • The Days After • The Surrender of Japan and Her Recovery • My America and "Pearl Harbor" • Hiroshima and Me • At the End

Why I Survived the A-Bomb

Hardbound, 230 pages, photos, notes, appendices (#0935)
\$16.45 postpaid (CA sales tax \$1.08)

Institute For Historical Review
PO Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA



Holocaust survivor
and author
Albert Kawachi

Typhus and Cholera, Nazis and Jews

Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945 by Paul Weindling. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Hardcover. 463 pages. Index, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY SAMUEL CROWELL

There is a certain class of history books that are interesting and valuable in spite of a lack of original insight or creativity on the part of the author. Richard Evans's massive tome on the nineteenth century outbreaks of cholera in North Germany, *Death in Hamburg*, is one such. Paul Weindling's *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe* is another. Weindling's book, however, contains elements of Jewish apologetics and consistent anti-German condemnation that are exceptional even in today's climate, and are perhaps the book's most striking feature.

For the most part, the book is a highly detailed and commendably researched description of the development of medical procedures developed for combating epidemic diseases in Eastern Europe from the mid-nineteenth century through the end of the Second World War. In this respect it provides a useful supplement to Fritz Berg's pioneering English language studies in this area. The book also raises themes discussed in my own work: it would not be too much to say that Weindling provides an enormously expanded treatment of the history of disinfection summarized in chapter three of *The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes*, an essay which sought to demonstrate the reasonableness of revisionist doubt in the face of threats of censorship. Weindling's book is, after all, based on many of the same sources.

It would wrong, however, to suggest that Weindling argues from a revisionist perspective, or that he gives due credit to revisionist contributions. On the contrary, the main thesis of his book is that the Germans developed the techniques of disinfection — showers, poison gas, and cremation — and then, working from an

evolving perception of Jews as vermin to be eradicated, employed these techniques during the war as part of a "lethal trinity" for genocidal purposes. For example, Weindling writes that "the medical techniques of disinfection, fumigation, and disinfection ... were unleashed by the Nazis for genocide" (p. 400), a thesis which is dropped into the text dozens of times, but nowhere really argued, let alone proved. Similarly, his notion of a developed concept of associating Jews with vermin, and thus requiring extermination, rests entirely on a series of vaguely anti-Jewish remarks culled from almost a hundred years of German medical literature on the typhus problem in Eastern Europe.

Which brings us to the larger issue of Weindling's extreme apologetic tendencies. That Eastern European Jews — like virtually any other Eastern Europeans — were vectors of typhus and other diseases endemic to the region is a simple fact. Similarly, the aversion of Eastern Europeans to disinfection measures, such as head-shaving and showering, is also universally attested by commentators, and indeed by many of the sources Weindling quotes. Yet any expression of irritation at the evasive or dilatory reactions to disinfection, or of fear of the contagiousness of Eastern Europeans, is likely to be catalogued by Weindling as simply further indication of the supposedly evolving anti-Semitic stereotype that would, decades later, make possible mass murder.

Weindling's defensiveness in this area reaches a high point in his discussion of the well-known cholera epidemic of 1892, which struck Hamburg, and New York City later the same year. Weindling quotes the assessment of leading German physician Robert Koch that the cholera had been brought in by Russian immigrants. Yet, at the end of a tortured paragraph of reasoning, Weindling argues that "there is no conclusive proof for the view held at the time by anti-Semites that Russian Jews caused the Hamburg cholera epidemic" (p. 63). Our first reaction to this kind of display is to wonder why the author chooses to waste the reader's time with such argument. If Russian immigrants were the source of the disease in Hamburg, and most of them were Jews, then the conclusion should be obvious. We should stress that this in no way should be considered a slur on the Jewish migrants: they were, after all, fleeing persecution, carrying diseases to which they themselves succumbed, and were usually destitute: King Cholera, like most diseases, reigned mostly over the poor. But to argue around the point, just so anti-

Samuel Crowell is the pen name of an American writer who describes himself as a "moderate revisionist." At the University of California (Berkeley) he studied philosophy, foreign languages (including German, Polish, Russian, and Hungarian), and history, including Russian, German, and German-Jewish history. He continued his study of history at Columbia University. For six years he worked as a college teacher.

Semites will never be right, or, perhaps, to ensure that a people is never stigmatized, is not only to distort history but to write history which hardly bears reading.

Unfortunately, these apologetic tendencies are repeatedly at work in this book. Resistance against disinfection is excused because it was harsh and dehumanizing. Avoidance of head shaving was justified because there was divided opinion as to whether head lice were vectors of typhus. If Germans characterized Polish Jewish prostitutes as disease-ridden and lousy, Weindling is quick to point out that the incidence of gonorrhea and syphilis was higher in German cities. The threat of typhus in Eastern Europe was exaggerated by unnamed "medical elites" in order to justify the enormous expenditures by Germans, Britons, and Americans to combat it. Typhus itself is described in innocuous terms; the delirium of the disease as it approaches climax is characterized as an "act of spiritual resistance" when experienced by concentration camp inmates (p. 6). And so on.

Weindling is just as biased when it comes to arguing his thesis, which seems to involve little more than demonizing Germans. The rigor of German procedures is routinely characterized in the most unflattering terms; the developments of German medicine are stereotypically portrayed as flat-footed, unimaginative, and factious. On one page, Weindling will praise the American development of DDT, while castigating German caution. On the next page, he is bound to admit that "Ironically, the Germans showed greater awareness of the toxicity of DDT, problems of acquired resistance, and the ecological hazards of its deployment" (p. 380) — in other words, precisely the factors that led them to be cautious in the first place!

Elsewhere, Weindling notes the fact that the Germans developed extensive procedures to protect against gas warfare; but because "the Germans were deploying poison gas against civilians," this must have been meant to protect the "perpetrators" (p. 387). Elsewhere, while scrupulously avoiding any mention of the notorious British anthrax plans, Weindling launches into a long discussion about German plans for biological warfare, a discussion which, in the end, seems to turn on the fact that the Germans were afraid of being attacked by such agents themselves, and had unreasonable fears about being attacked with diseases by their captive populations. To be sure, the German fears were probably excessive, but it would have helped if Weindling had mentioned that Jan Karski, among others, has

bragged about how Polish resistants were infecting German soldiers with typhus. In the same vein, Weindling uncritically repeats Stalinist accusations of German biological warfare in the 1930s.

The all-important section of the book, for relevance to revisionism, proposes the linkage of the highly developed German disinfection procedures with the assumed mass extermination policies in the camps. Here the main character is Joachim Mrugowsky, head of the SS Hygiene Institute. Weindling proposes Mrugowsky's culpability in genocide, by association if nothing else, in a lengthy argument, while Mrugowsky's protestations that Zyklon was used solely for disinfection are duly referenced and completely ignored.

Strikingly absent from the discussion as well, especially for a book as thoroughly researched as this one, is Dr. Mrugowsky's order of May 13, 1943, mandating to the entire concentration camp system that henceforth Zyklon would be used solely for fumigating barracks. (See Crowell, "Bomb Shelters in Birkenau," section 3.7, <http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconbsinbirk.html>) Certainly this document is important in assessing Mrugowsky's veracity. Another omission of this type concerns World War One disinfection measures: although Weindling is thorough in referencing the literature that revisionists have used in the past, he omits in his discussion of Austrian disinfection procedures any reference to the fact that such procedures, as Faurisson has shown, led to false reports of mass gassing. As though to compensate for this omission, Weindling relates without comment the accusation that the Turks gassed Armenian infants in 1917 in a steam bath. (p. 106)

When discussing the actual mechanics of the Holocaust, Weindling's impressive grasp of the archives gives way to a derivative section depending largely on the contributions of Jean-Claude Pressac, Henry Friedlander (for euthanasia), Robert Jan Van Pelt and Deborah Dwork, and Eugen Kogon's compendium *Nazi Mass Murder with Poison Gas*. As is well known to revisionists, these books in turn are based largely on testimony and anecdote, supplemented occasionally with interrogation records and a smattering of survivor accounts. As a result, Weindling's discussion of the Jewish catastrophe amounts to little more than a disjointed and gullible regurgitation of the greatest hits of Holocaust arcana, all the way from Kurt Gerstein's wild reports to such suspicious claims as the story of the champagne party thrown by the staff of the Hadamar

euthanasia center on the cremation of their ten thousandth corpse. This is the weakest and least interesting part of the book.

The book is poorly written, not only because of its endless slanting and argument, but because the body of the text consists in many places of repeated information, to no clear purpose. While that makes the book largely unusable for the general reader, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945* is a great boon for those who are deeply interested in its subject. The book contains much interesting and surprising detail that will delight the expert, and the scope of the research commands respect.

In the end, these elements save this book. Although betraying an irritating bias, Weindling has written a good and solid book about the dilemmas of epidemics and their prevention that will be of great use to Holocaust scholars, and to revisionists in particular. We can only regret that he didn't write from a more objective and humane perspective, for then he might have produced a much better one.

Destruction Destroyed

The Giant with Feet of Clay: Raul Hilberg and His "Standard Work" on the Holocaust by Jürgen Graf. Capshaw, Alabama: Theses and Dissertations Press, 2001. Paperback. 128 pages. Index, bibliography, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY THEODORE O'KEEFE

In *The Giant with Feet of Clay*, the able and productive revisionist researcher and polemicist Jürgen Graf has undertaken to examine the standard scholarly treatment of the Holocaust, Professor Raul Hilberg's *Destruction of the European Jews*, in exacting detail. Graf's treatment of *Giant* is both less and more than a book review. He has chosen to concentrate on the essentials, those sections of *Destruction* which bear directly on the alleged mass killing, ignoring the great swathes of Hilberg's elephantine work which describe the undisputed persecution of Jews throughout wartime Axis Europe. The result is a first-rate introduction to the substance and method of the revisionist challenge to the Holocaust, at no more than the size and length of pre-1993 editions of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Even the case-hardened revisionist will be surprised to see how little of *Destruction* remains after the 1,231



Raul Hilberg

pages of the three volume edition of 1985 are winnowed of all but those sections that deal with the evidence for a plan and an order to exterminate European Jewry, the actual mass killings, and the number of Jews said to have perished as a result of them. Graf is sharp on tracking Hilberg's unexplained turnabout on the existence of the Hitler extermination order. He notes that Hilberg had claimed two successive Hitler orders in the original (1961) edition of *Destruction*, then points out that the historian has omitted all mention of any such order by Hitler in his "definitive" 1985 edition. Graf's reminder of Hilberg's 1983 statement that the Holocaust was not planned in advance, nor organized centrally by any agency, without blueprint or budget, but was instead achieved by "an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus-mind reading by a far-flung bureaucracy," deftly torpedoed his target's credibility here (as well as underlining the advisability of junking most of the flow charts and the rosters of bureaucrats and policemen with which *Destruction* abounds).

In the world of orthodox Holocaustology, Hilberg passes for a document and policy man, who more than once has expressed his distaste for the indulgence given the eyewitness testimony of "survivors" and other self-interested parties, such as the late propagandist Jan Karski. As Graf mercilessly exposes in his focus on the heart of the Holocaust claim, however, the professor is for all practical purposes entirely dependent on the testimony of survivors and the confessions of German captives in his efforts to substantiate the outlandish accusations made on what Hilberg calls "the killing centers." Vrba, Wiesel, Nyiszli, Filip Müller, Gerstein, Höss, and more: every one of these key Hilberg witnesses to the gas chambers has had his credibility anni-



Jürgen Graf addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000.

hilated by the revisionists, and is increasingly doubted by exterminationists as well. In quick but deft analyses of the testimony of each of Hilberg's eyewitness authorities for the gas chambers, Graf shows why.

Graf shines brightest in dispelling the murk that veils Auschwitz, Treblinka, and other supposed "killing centers." Here the author, instead of devoting himself to the spatial studies ("gas chambers" and crematoria) preferred by other revisionists, has carefully studied the timeline alleged by Hilberg for the development of the extermination process (from gas vans to stationery chambers, from burial to open-air burning to cremation, etc.). Carefully correlating Hilberg's sources, including Gerstein and Höss, Graf makes mincemeat of Hilberg's widely accepted schema: instead of rational development there is contradiction, confusion, backtracking, and general absurdity. Nowhere, Graf shows, is the "incredible meeting of the minds" less credible in explaining the alleged "final solution" than in accounting for the origins and functioning of its key machinery.

Giant's treatment of Hilberg's accounts of the deportations, mass shootings, and estimated number of Jewish dead is spirited, though in view of the space and evidence, available, not as comprehensive. Each treatment, however, gives a more than adequate survey of how the state of recent knowledge renders Hilberg's

"standard treatment" not merely out of date, but dead wrong.

This is a translation, and an adequate one. Graf has worked from the 1997 German edition of *Destruction*, but mercifully his citations are in the English of Hilberg's original, rather than rendered into a variant retroversion, as happens all too commonly. There are too many Britishisms, and too many Germanisms. The sarcasm and argumentativeness of *The Giant* do not always work well in translation.

The Giant with the Feet of Clay remains a very worthwhile book. According to the Arthur Butz, who took Hilberg's measure a quarter century ago in his magisterial *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*: "This book has great educational value provided it is studied, rather than read." That's true: a clever sixteen year old who reads *Giant* will be able to crush Hilberg and flabbergast her instructor. (She'll probably come away with an F, but that's another matter.) Which isn't to deter those readers who might look on *Giant* as a homework assignment: Jürgen Graf has written a lively, readable, up-to-date handbook to reveal that Raul Hilberg and his Holocaust, if not exactly giants, certainly have feet of clay.

Georgi K. Zhukov From Moscow to Berlin Marshal Zhukov's Greatest Battles



The greatest Soviet commander tells how he directed the Red Army's bitter last-ditch defense of Moscow, master-minded the encirclement and defeat of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad, smashed the last great German counteroffensive of Kursk-Orel, and led the climactic assault on Hitler's Berlin. Must

reading for every student of military history. Hardcover, 304 pp., photos, maps, \$12.95, plus \$2.50 for shipping.

Available from
IHR • POB 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Don't Settle for the Disney Version!

The Classic Unraveling of the 'Day of Infamy' Mystery



"... Perhaps the most brilliant and impressive monograph on diplomatic history ever turned out by a nonprofessional student of the subject ..."

— Harry Elmer Barnes

"With all the elements at hand, the reader has the ingredients of a mystery story. There are victims — 3,000 of them in the Pearl Harbor attack. There are a variety of clues. There are a multitude of false leads. There are numerous possible motives. Innumerable obstructions are put in the way of the discovery of truth. Many of the characters betray guilty knowledge."

— From the author's foreword
to *Pearl Harbor*

Hailed by scholars Charles Beard, Harry Elmer Barnes and Charles Tansill, George Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* remains unsurpassed as a one-volume treatment of America's Day of Infamy.

Pearl Harbor: The ^{Real} Story of the Secret War

An indispensable introduction to the question of who bears the blame for the Pearl Harbor surprise, and, more important, for America's entry into World War II through the Pacific 'back door.'


In his introduction to this attractive IHR edition, Dr. James Martin comments: "Morgenstern's book is, in this writer's opinion, still the best about the December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor attack, despite a formidable volume of subsequent writing by many others on the subject."

Admiral H. E. Yarnell, former Pearl Harbor naval base commandant, wrote: "Mr. Morgenstern is to be congratulated on marshalling the available facts of this tragedy in such a manner as to make it clear to every reader where the responsibility lies."

Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War by George Morgenstern

Quality Softcover. 435 pages. Maps. Source notes. Index. (0978)
\$8.95, plus shipping (\$3.00 domestic, \$6.50 foreign)
California residents must add \$.69 sales tax

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA



Blame Enough

Mark Weber's article, "The Jewish Role in the Bolshevik Revolution and the Early Soviet Regime" JHR 14, no. 1 (Jan-Feb 1994) contained the following statement: "... to blame 'the Jews' for the horrors of Communism seems no more justifiable than to blame 'white people' for Negro slavery, or 'the Germans' for the Second World War or 'the Holocaust.'"

I disagree! I believe the Jews can be blamed, as they are of a culture of Talmudic Judaism that sees gentiles as something less than human, and themselves as superior beings meant to rule over them. A recent quote of Ariel Sharon's may illustrate this, "A hundred (or was it a thousand) Palestinian lives are not worth one Jewish fingernail." It seems the Jewish Bolsheviks had the same idea.

Where does such thinking come from if not within their own culture. From what I have read it seems that they believe that the reign of their Messiah is near and then the whole world will be subject to them. May the Lord have pity on us. It would be Russia all over again, but on a world wide scale. I could quote from their Talmud to substantiate this, but I imagine you are aware of this yourself. To be so unobjective, perhaps thinking that you are being charitable, does not bring anyone closer to the truth. Perhaps it would be best to delete that paragraph from your article.

I always enjoy your writings and find criticizing any thing you write as quite unpalatable. Keep up the good work.

R. K.

[The question of collective guilt is a serious one. Without resorting to the facile evasions of the atomistic version of Jewish peoplehood presented us by

Jewish apologists ("Any time you get a hundred Jews together, you have a 101 different opinions"), we note that analogs to "a culture of Talmudic Judaism," such as "white racism" and "eliminationist anti-Semitism," have been advanced as motivations for the behavior of American white and German collectives. The Journal will thus stick to fearless criticism of Jewish behavior, as warranted, without resort to all-embracing theories. And thanks for bearing with us. — Ed.]

To Be Precise

I have just received the latest JHR [July-August 2001], a very interesting issue. I am amazed that the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* devotes so much space to al-Hajj Amin al-Husayni. It's absurd. I'm sure he never had much influence on German strategic thinking on how to solve the Jewish problem. The charge is utter fantasy, built on fiction.

One minor correction is necessary. A mufti is not a judge, properly speaking, as described in the JHR's article (page 11). A better translation would be "jurisconsult" in Islamic law. Traditionally, persons with legal problem go to a mufti and get his decision (fatwa) on their cases, as the petitioners describe them. They then take the fatwa to court and use it in their argument before the judge. Quite possibly the other side will have a fatwa to support its claims as well. The mufti, in giving fatwas, does not rule on whether the people coming to him are telling the whole truth. He merely gives a legal opinion based on the facts as they are presented to him. Thus the fatwa may turn out to be irrelevant, if the judge determines that the parties to the case concealed important facts from

the mufti. But the fatwa is important if the facts as determined agree with the story told to the mufti. Such a fatwa can serve as a precedent in other cases, particularly if the mufti who issued it is highly regarded. I don't know of al-Hajj Amin al-Husayni ever actually functioned as a mufti, but he had the training to occupy that traditional post that went back to Ottoman days.

M. E., Plano, Texas

Rightful Repose?

I was very impressed with the latest issue [JHR 20, no. 4 (Jul.-Aug. 2001)], in particular with Revisionist News and Comment, which hit the nail right on the head. I found Mark Weber's review of volume II of David Irving's *Churchill's War* very informative as well. My wife says I am lazy and should at least write book reviews. I have a book *Erfundene Geschichte: Unsere Zeitrechnung Ist Falsch* (Fabricated History: Our Chronology Is Wrong) by Uwe Topper (perhaps we're actually living in the year 1702!) which I have considered reviewing, but I always remind myself that I am retired. In other words, I am lazy.

Dr. H.-E. S.

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space. Write: Editor, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA, or e-mail us at editor@ihr.org




The Most Important Dissection of the Holocaust Story in Years!

Packed with stunning revelations, this scholarly, attractive and well-referenced work is the best revisionist critique of the Holocaust story to appear in years.

In this big (8 1/2 x 11 inches), illustrated, 600-page collection, 17 specialists — chemists, engineers, geologists, historians and jurists — subject Holocaust claims to withering scrutiny. They expose bogus testimonies, falsified statistics, doctored photos, distorted documents, farcical trials, and technological absurdities. They provide expert examinations of the alleged Holocaust murder weapons: gas vans and gas chambers.

- Carlo Mattogno, "The Gas Chambers of Majdanek"



- H. Tiedemann, "Babi Yar: Critical Questions and Comments"
- Udo Walendy, "Do Photographs Prove the NS Extermination of the Jews?"

Writes Dr. Arthur R. Butz: "There is at present no other single volume that so provides a serious reader with a broad understanding of the contemporary state of historical issues that influential people would rather not have examined."

It's no wonder that alarmed authorities banned the original German edition, ordering all remaining copies confiscated and burned.

Dissecting the Holocaust is edited by Germar Rudolf ("Ernst Gauss"), a certified chemist, born in 1964, who wrote "The 'Rudolf Report,' a detailed on-site forensic examination of the "gas chamber" claims of Auschwitz and Birkenau. After a German court sentenced him to 14 months imprisonment, he fled his homeland and has been living ever since in exile as a political refugee. Since 1997, he has been editor of the German-language historical journal *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*.

Among the 22 essays in this anthology are:

- Germar Rudolf (E. Gauss), "The Controversy about the Extermination of the Jews."
- Robert Faurisson, Preface and "Witnesses to the Gas Chambers of Auschwitz"
- John C. Ball, "Air Photo Evidence"
- Mark Weber, "'Extermination' Camp Propaganda Myths"
- Friedrich P. Berg, "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth within a Myth"

DISSECTING THE HOLOCAUST: THE GROWING CRITIQUE OF 'TRUTH' AND MEMORY

Edited by "Ernst Gauss" (Germar Rudolf)

Hardcover. Full color dust jacket. Large-size format. 603 pages.

Photographs. Charts. Source references. Index. (#0319)

\$50, plus shipping (Calif. add \$3.88 sales tax)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

A revisionist classic and indispensable resource for scholar and layman alike!

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein


Here is the headline-making university doctoral dissertation that debunks the key "Holocaust" testimony of SS officer Kurt Gerstein — the enigmatic, twisted Third Reich functionary who claimed to have witnessed mass gassings of Jews in 1942. In this closely argued study a French scholar subjects Gerstein's accusations to critical examination, striking at the very roots of the Holocaust extermination story. The stunning conclusion: not only are Gerstein's allegations of mass killings of Jews groundless, but prominent Holocaust historians have deliberately manipulated and falsified key parts of Gerstein's tortured testimony.

This powerful exposé and its author made world headlines in 1986 when, for the first time in the nearly eight-century history of French universities, a duly awarded doctorate was revoked by government order.

Gerstein's bogus "confessions" were the basis of the anti-German and anti-Catholic hysteria stirred by Rolf Hochhuth's play "The Deputy." Roques' study thus shatters the myth of Pope Pius XII's complicity in Holocaust genocide.



Henri Roques



British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper (Lord Dacre) praised this study as "an entirely legitimate, scholarly and responsible work of *Quellenkritik* [source critique] on a limited but important subject."

Michel de Bouard of the Institut de France declared: "Had I been a member of the jury, I would probably have given a grade of 'very good' to Mr. Roques' thesis."

Includes transcripts and translations of all six versions of Gerstein's "testimonies," as well as facsimiles of the original texts and other previously unpublished documents and records. Translated from the French by Ronald Percival, who also provides a foreword.

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein

by Henri Roques

Quality softcover. 325 pp. Charts. Index. (#0687)

ISBN 0-939484-27-7

\$7.50, plus \$2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA